



* 1700018144 *

MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE
CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

ANDREW S. THOMAS
MEMORIAL LIBRARY



Call Number

204
Ei8c

Accession

6107

DATE DUE

~~APR 25 '64~~

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CHRISTIANITY TO-DAY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

CHRISTIANITY TO-DAY

BY

FREDERICK C. EISELEN

DOREMUS A. HAYES

WILLIAM D. SCHERMERHORN

LESLEY E. FULLER ERNEST F. TITTLE

IRL G. WHITCHURCH

HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL

(EDITOR)

*Members of the Faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute
Evanston, Illinois*

WITH A FOREWORD BY

C. COPELAND SMITH

*Pastor of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church
Chicago, Illinois*



W. H. R. 117
Do not return to library.

COKESBURY PRESS
NASHVILLE, TENN.

1928

COPYRIGHT, 1928
BY
LAMAR & WHITMORE

Printed in the United States of America

To

THOSE CHRISTIAN MINISTERS

WHO ARE SEEKING TO INTER-
PRET THE OLD MESSAGE IN
THIS NEW DAY, THIS VOLUME
IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

PREFACE

As indicated in the foreword, this volume had its origin in a series of lectures given over radio by members of the faculty of Garrett Biblical Institute, a graduate school of theology affiliated with Northwestern University. The lectures were broadcast over WCFL, located on the Municipal Pier, Chicago, the addresses being transmitted from Grace Methodist Church. For the purpose of publication the lectures have been revised and enlarged and two chapters added.

This volume makes no pretense of covering the field of theology in outline, or even of setting forth the main problems which Christian thought considers to-day. It does indicate, however, the way in which modern teachers of religion face their task. The standpoint of these writers is distinctly that of the Christian religion, but it is *Christianity To-Day* with which they are concerned. They have in mind not only the pastor, but the thoughtful layman. For the problems of religious thought as affected by modern knowledge have taken an ever larger place in current books and periodicals of all kinds, and intelligent laymen are asking how it stands

with Christianity to-day. They know what modern science is teaching through endless articles and books given to the popularizing of its results. But what about progressive leaders of religious thought?

So from various departments these men were selected to suggest some of the important questions in their field and the way in which these questions were being met. One group of subjects is biblical. Here is considered the new conception of the Bible—the person of the prophet, the contribution of the Old Testament to the New, of the New Testament to the ideal of culture, and that interesting period just preceding the coming of Jesus.

A second group of chapters deals more with questions of Christian doctrine in the light of the new conditions and new knowledge which theology faces. What Christianity really is and the bearing of this on the pressing question of Christian unity, the meaning of science for our faith in God, and the message of Christianity as a religion of redemption in the face of present-day needs, are the subjects here considered.

A third group of chapters deals with questions in the realm of ethics and Church life, with Christianity as it faces such diverse problems as that of international relations,

of war, of the changing standards of conduct, and of social justice. Distinctly personal is the closing chapter which indicates how the preacher, who is also teacher, unites modern thought with the interests of personal spiritual life. An introductory chapter deals with the need of the teaching ministry and its importance, and suggests some of its problems.

HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD. By the Rev. C. Copeland Smith, D.D., Pastor of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Chicago, Illinois.	15

CHAPTER I

THE TEACHING MINISTRY AND ITS MESSAGE. By Harris Franklin Rall, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute. . .	21
--	----

CHAPTER II

THE USE OF THE BIBLE TO-DAY. By Frederick Carl Eiselen, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, Garrett Biblical Institute.	41
--	----

CHAPTER III

THE PROPHET AS PREACHER. By Frederick Carl Eiselen.	57
---	----

CHAPTER IV

WHAT THE OLD TESTAMENT GAVE TO THE NEW. By Leslie Elmer Fuller, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testa- ment Interpretation, Garrett Biblical Institute. . . .	74
---	----

CHAPTER V

WHAT HAPPENED BETWEEN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE NEW. By Leslie Elmer Fuller.	86
--	----

CHAPTER VI

PAGE

- THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEAL OF CHRISTIAN CULTURE. By Doremus Almy Hayes, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Garrett Biblical Institute..... 101

CHAPTER VII

- CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE EARLY CHURCH. By Harris Franklin Rall..... 113

CHAPTER VIII

- FAITH IN GOD IN AN AGE OF SCIENCE. By Harris Franklin Rall..... 130

CHAPTER IX

- MESSIAHS, NEW AND OLD. By Harris Franklin Rall. 152

CHAPTER X

- CAN WE EXPORT CHRISTIANITY? By William David Schermerhorn, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History and Missions, Garrett Biblical Institute... 169

CHAPTER XI

- CHRISTIANITY AND THE NATIONS. By William David Schermerhorn..... 185

CHAPTER XII

- OUR CHANGING MORALS. By Irl Goldwin Whitchurch, Ph.D., B.D., Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute..... 201

CHAPTER XIII

PAGE

THE JUSTICE OF JESUS. By Irl Goldwin Whitchurch. 218

CHAPTER XIV

THE SWORD AND THE SPIRIT. By the Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, D.D., Pastor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Evanston, and Lecturer on Homiletics in Garrett Biblical Institute. 239

CHAPTER XV

WHY READ THE BIBLE? By the Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle. 257

FOREWORD

TWENTY-SEVEN years ago, when I was an undergraduate of Manchester University, England, the faculty of the Divinity School of that University prepared a series of lectures on "Religion and Life" at the suggestion of one of the progressive pastors of that great city. The lectures were delivered in a hall accommodating 2,000 persons. For twelve weeks every Sunday afternoon that hall was crowded to the doors. Afterwards the lectures were published in popular form and enjoyed a remarkable sale.

Two facts surprised me at that time. The first was that the lecturers, while making concessions to the popular mind in methods of presentation, surrendered nothing of their scholarship. The other fact was that the audience, required as it was to exert a great deal of mental effort, did not diminish with the weeks, but grew in numbers. No ordinary political issue could have captured the crowds during so long a period. I came to see thus early that religion is the dominant interest in the mind of man and that, if honored with a clear presentation of its issues, the average man was eager to endure the mental effort in-

volved in listening to its claims. I have since wondered whether we preachers have not to regret the diminishing size of Protestant audiences chiefly because we have not sufficiently honored their intellectual demands upon us.

Radio broadcasting was not dreamed of twenty-seven years ago. During the past five years it has become a universal means of human intercourse. At first devoted almost solely to the task of keeping the people amused, there began to grow a new consciousness of the value of broadcasting for the more serious purposes of life. The character of radio programs altered. Still chiefly used as a means of amusement, the microphone has increasingly become a medium for the education of the masses and the broadening of the common outlook upon the problems of life.

But the Church has been slow to use this new agency. There are several reasons for this. One is the undoubted conservatism of organized religion. The Church, as a whole, is generally the last of organized institutions to adapt itself to changes of method. Another reason is our poverty. Broadcasting is costly, and the average Church is not rich. Its program is always bigger than its purse—and should be. But the big reason is that organized

religion nearly always has a denominational and therefore a limited appeal, while the radio should make a universal approach. Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles, black and white, all are able to tune in and tune out on any station at any time, without respect to the prohibition of priest or minister and without visible offense to the speaker.

The radio has little use for denominational religion. The *Chicago Daily Tribune* recently sent out a questionnaire from its great broadcasting station, WGN, giving a list of various kinds of radio programs and inviting its hearers to check the kind they preferred. Religious services of the ordinary denominational kind came at the bottom of the poll. On the other hand, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, broadcasting answers to religious questions he receives week by week, estimates that 3,000,000 persons listen in to those answers broadcast through WEAJ every Sunday, and his audience is growing as the number of stations on the chain increases. Early last year the invitation came to me to follow Dr. Cadman's example in the mid-West and broadcast answers to religious and moral questions from my pulpit. At the same time we began broadcasting the morning worship of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church. So far as it relates to the

morning service of this Church, the effect on the congregations has been bad rather than good. So far as the Question Box on Sunday afternoons is concerned, we have been snowed under with all manner of queries relating to religion and morals. This work is being made possible, on its financial side, by men and women of every Church and of none. Members of the Hebrew race as well as Catholics are among the most generous contributors.

Among the most lonely folk, as revealed through the Question Box, were some of the ministers. The mail began to show that there were pastors in far places who were hungering for intellectual stimulus in religious thinking. There were many who found little in their environment to encourage deep reading and close thinking. These had their questions also, questions that were different from those asked by the general public. An hour was set aside each Monday for broadcasting answers to these pastors. During the same hour I endeavored to describe some new book of philosophical or religious import. Once again it was demonstrated that we had discovered a need; a need which the busy pastor of a city Church was not able entirely to satisfy, even if his scholastic equipment were much greater than my own. It was in these circumstances

that I talked with my friends, President Frederick C. Eiselen and Professor Harris Franklin Rall, of Garrett Biblical Institute. Early in December, 1927, the series of lectures published in this volume was projected. Dr. Eiselen delivered the first lecture on December 11, and it immediately became apparent that he had sensed the demands of the situation by the appeal he made to the intellectual interest of ministers and workers of all Churches. The fine example set in that first lecture was followed by his successors. There was not a sectarian word in these addresses. Neither was there a merely popular word, although the appeal was popular. Letters from the laity state that, although the Monday hour was devoted to pastors, they had ventured to listen in and had determined to continue doing so. From one college word came of a group of students who were following the course. A number of pastors announced the addresses and urged their people to listen in.

But it was the minister of whom we were thinking. Amid the crowding mass of details that afflict the life of the modern pastor, the danger of intellectual isolation becomes more ominous and the temptation to intellectual sloth more insidious. In the smaller communities there is the added peril of the minister

approximating his outlook to the narrow perspective of the small community. It is in the small parish that big thoughts are apt to die and narrow bigotries take their place. There is nothing narrow in the outlook of this volume. It calls to the intellectual deeps of the minds of its readers. Like all true scholarship, it has a reconciling aim. The ways of God may here, in some measure, be reconciled to the thoughts of man concerning him. The different theologies of the Churches may here find some point of common approach, some bond of unity. If any or all of these objects are achieved, even in part, the intention of those who inaugurated this series of lectures will be realized.

C. COPELAND SMITH.

GRACE METHODIST CHURCH, CHICAGO, ILL.

I

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE AND THE TEACHING MINISTRY

BY HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL

CHRISTIANITY is a religion with a message. That message involves an appeal not only to heart and conscience, but to mind as well. The Church has no greater task to-day than to see that message clearly and to set it forth in such manner that others will both understand and accept.

Such is the position that lies back of this volume, and this chapter seeks to set forth what it means. A teaching ministry is the strength and glory of the Christian Church. Jesus himself began his work, not as legislator, or wonder worker, or ecclesiastical organizer, but as teacher. To that great task Paul gave himself, making his appeal to Roman, Greek, and Jew as he pointed out the claims of the new religion, and then setting forth to those who had avowed it its meaning for faith and life. The great epochs of religious revival in Christianity have been marked eras of revival in preaching and teaching and of keen interest in exploration and restatement of Christian

truth. That was plainly true of the reformation under Luther. It was equally true of Wesley, a lifelong student and teacher with an unwearying demand upon his preachers and his people that they should likewise be readers and students. With none of these great leaders was the primary emphasis on the intellect; with all of them there was the clear understanding that Christianity involved a great conviction.

In interesting contrast with this is the modern situation in the Church. Intellectual indifference, if not intellectual timidity, has largely marked our Church life during the last generation. The attitudes of various groups were naturally different, but too often they have agreed at this point. There was what might be called the traditionalist, or dogmatic, attitude. The intellectual expression of Christianity was not ignored by this group; it was indeed emphasized. For them Christianity was primarily a sum of supernaturally revealed dogma, fixed once and for all, and henceforth to be held and proclaimed without reference to the growing knowledge of men. The error of this position as an interpretation of Christianity is pointed out in Chapter VII of this volume. It is essentially the position of Roman Catholicism, which makes Christianity an

institution, fixed and changeless, rather than a great living, historical movement, inspired by its Founder and maintaining itself in the living experience of his followers. As a matter of fact, however, this emphasis on doctrine meant no appeal to the thought of men, but rather the reverse. The doctrines were to be accepted on authority; the appeal was not to inner conviction. In form and substance they were fixed once for all, and men were warned against earnest thought or active search for truth which might imperil these formulations of the past. The eager, open mind, that dared to see new truth under the guidance of the Spirit and to state it, had no place in such a movement. Hence the complaint of a prominent educational leader of one of the great communions of this country, which in the past has emphasized scholarship, that its theologians no longer wrote great books on religion or dared to undertake them.

But other groups were equally at fault. There were those who said: Religion is an affair of the heart and the will; let us turn from sterile discussion and give ourselves to the practical. Sometimes the emphasis was put on evangelism and personal religious experience. One Methodist journal printed with apparent approval the words of a well-known

preacher: "I despise theology and botany, but I love religion and flowers." He might as well have said: I love sentiment and emotion, but I hate to think. These men have failed to see that it is not enough to have men converted; they must know what it is to which they are converted. The evangelism of Jesus challenged the faith and allegiance of men with a great message, and summoned them to a great conviction about God and life and the world. For too many evangelicals in the past everything led up to the moment of conversion, and ended there; just as in the old-fashioned romance, everything happened before the wedding, and all the rest could be dismissed with, "They lived happy ever after." Nowadays the important events come after the wedding; and the trouble with us in the Church is that too little happens after the conversion. That is where the real business of Christianity begins. And a big part of that business is getting a large vision of Christianity and understanding what it means in terms of convictions that illumine and ideals that inform this life.

Perhaps it is too much to say that everything was supposed to be settled at conversion. The second group illustrates, indeed, the contrary. These are the managers, the or-

ganizers, the promoters, the preachers of action. Some denominations, of course, have more of them than others. Their activity is the outstanding feature of our American Church life as it impresses the visitor from across the seas. Action, organization, service, stewardship, campaigns, drives, committees, conferences, budgets, apportionments—these are the terms beloved by this group. Religion is something that we have to “sell,” to “put over.” Christianity is an organization that must be established and kept functioning. The great aim is “results,” and the mark of results is statistics.

The need of this side of the Church's life is no more to be disputed than is the need of the work that brings men to a decision for Christ. But these leaders too often fail to see that organizing activity may be like asking wheels to turn when there is no power to drive them. The power to carry on this work must lie in clear and moving conviction concerning the final issues of life and in living experience of fellowship with God.

Different from the last group is what we may call the “social workers.” They would distinguish themselves sharply from the “ecclesiastical” crowd, and yet there is a real likeness at this point. They may be less in-

terested in promoting an institution, and yet they tend to fail at this same point. The editor of one of our best-known liberal journals was called upon to address a company of these men who were strongly interested in the great problem of applying Christianity to our unchristian social life. Are you not beginning at the wrong point, he said. Are you not making an unwarranted assumption? You are taking for granted that the Christian spirit is here, the devotion, the life, the dynamic; and that all that is needed is for us to point out how it is to be applied. The question is, is the life really there? Has the Christian Church this moral passion and the spiritual power to sustain it?

The raising of such a question is no excuse for timidity in social thinking or for the common failure to see the great social meanings of religion and apply Christianity vigorously to our social life. But the fact remains, you cannot carry on the Christianization of our social life unless you have back of this a body of clear and strong Christian conviction and of personal spiritual life. It is expecting to draw dividends without possessing capital stock.

We must have, then, two elements of the Christian life clearly and strongly represented if Christianity is to remain a going concern.

The first is the element of conviction, a clear and definite faith that holds to God and sees the meaning of the world and life in the light of the eternal. It is with this aspect of religion that the present discussion deals. That does not, of course, mean a derogation from the primary importance of religion as a life of fellowship with God. Let it be said plainly that the Church has no greater task than the cultivation of this life in its people, especially through a better and more effective direction of public worship. Yet even in this aspect of experience, it is not mere emotion that counts; it is an experience that is interpreted, one that has meaning. Clear conviction, even here, becomes a necessity. For you must take such an experience as that out into the world. It will meet the hard conditions that challenge faith and seem to deny it utterly. It will meet rival philosophies of life, popular and seductive, with their phrases on every man's lips. And the faith itself will be challenged to declare its meaning, to set forth the light that it has about God and the world and human life and the way of life for men and nations.

Now the plain facts warrant the severe statement that the Church has been neglecting its teaching job at a time when that task was

as urgent as it ever was in all her long history. Surely the pulpit must give leadership here, whatever other agencies there may be. Our pulpits abound with illustration and exhortation, with appealing sentiment and rhetoric, sometimes with self-induced emotion that is taken for spiritual power; but there is too little clear and informed preaching which sets forth the truths of the Christian faith in orderly manner or defines sharply the great principles of Christian ethics and makes plain their meaning for life. One reason for this lies in the kind of doctrinal teaching that has been common in the past.

Doctrines meant something more or less remote from life, formulated by the Church once upon a time, and now handed down as a tradition of the past and a law that all must obey. The "defenders of the faith," usually self-appointed, were often to blame for this. They confused dogma with doctrine. Dogma is a creed enforced by the Church as a legal authority, to which men submit whether there be inner conviction or not. That is Roman Catholic, not Protestant, it is the bondage of the law and not the freedom of faith. Doctrine is simply teaching; it is the great liberating truth that is given in the Christian message set forth in clear and ordered fashion. It is

not apart from life; it grows out of life, and it bears directly upon life. In the Christian faith it means first of all the convictions about God that are the very heart of our experience. But it means equally the ideals of conduct and character which command our lives as those who believe in such a God.

If our Churches have been overlooking the meaning of doctrine, that has not been true elsewhere. Never has there been such a time of teaching as in these last years. Men said the Great War was a war of machines, a contest of material resources mechanically applied. There is truth in that, horrible truth, but it may be added that it was even more a war of ideas. By ideas I do not mean correct information or sober reflection; it was propaganda, which is not primarily devotion to the truth, but a systematic effort to make men think your way. But it was doctrine, teaching. The decisive blow came not only from the armed forces of the west, but from those ideals, formulated chiefly by America, which were introduced into Germany and at last, together with the knowledge that they had been deceived by their leaders, broke down the morale of the German people. Alas, that those same ideas were forgotten when the victors met at Versailles!

And the tide of propaganda is on to-day. Political parties, social and industrial movements, various national interests, all are joining. Men think of the soviet régime as a great organization depending upon force. That is true in part, but all observers agree that the Russian government is carrying on a most remarkable campaign in education in order to make the whole nation over into Marxian socialists. Out of all this one fact stands forth: for better or for worse the new world will be made not by the decisions of kings or presidents or parliaments, nor yet by the might of armies and fleets; it will be made by the ideas that win the suffrage of men. We have reached a new stage in history. The world is still far from democracy, but so much of democracy has come that henceforth the chief battles of the world will be those in which rival ideas fight for the votes of the people. The Great War may yet be seen as having marked the divide.

There was a time when great events hinged on the decision of the few, of kings or of chancellories or of captains of finance. It was the few that determined upon the Great War and brought it on, not the peoples. It was the few that in secret conclave, despite our advertised ideals, concocted the terms of peace. But the old era is past. The few began the war,

but the war was carried on only as these few were able to enlist the support of the many. That was true of every power that fought. France was on the verge of a breakdown once because of the attitude of the people. Russia dropped out because the peasant was sick of a war that had no meaning for his mind. It was the inner revolt that helped to break down Germany. A large part of the task of England and America was to win the conviction of the people. The ballot, the book, the newspaper, the public school, telephone, telegraph, and radio—all these have worked together. The common folk the world around to-day can know and think and decide; and the decisions of society in the future will be made by them.

But what has all this to do with the Church and doctrinal preaching? Everything. It speaks to the Church with trumpet tones: "He that hath ears let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches." Here are the plain facts: (1) The world's great questions are to be settled in the future not by authority or force, but by the ideas that can command the minds of men. (2) The great questions upon which humanity's life depends are at bottom every one moral and religious. (3) The ideals that must rule men if the world is to be saved are those that are found in the gospel of Jesus

Christ. And so there comes the summons to the Church: take up the ancient task, the task of prophet and apostle, of reformer and preacher and evangelist, and teach men!

But, it will be said, has not the Church been doing this teaching through the years? The answer to that question must be found in the results. And the events of recent years have given us an unusual test of this point. The great war and the years following showed us how far Christian faith and ideals had really gotten hold of men, of their lives, or even of their understanding.

Take the question of the understanding first. Has the Church made plain to men what Christianity meant? Never before did the Church have such a chance to test her work at this point. The youth of the Western nations were gathered together and the force of chaplains and Church workers was large enough to permit of unusual personal contact. At the close of the war the British and American workers, acting separately, made a careful study of the facts they had gathered. The British leaders declared that the salient fact was this, that four-fifths of the young manhood of their country had little or no connection with the Churches, and that back of this

lay a deep misunderstanding of the real meaning of the Christian faith and ideals. The American workers, in striking agreement, said that the most serious failure of the Church was its failure as teacher. "We have not succeeded in teaching Christianity to our own members, let alone distributing a clear knowledge of it through the community at large."

More striking still was the fact that the Western nations, nominally Christian, did not really hold the Christian faith or else did not know what it meant. They might repeat, "I believe in God the Father Almighty and in Jesus Christ." But they did not really believe that righteousness and love were the greatest forces in this world; they believed in bombs and submarines, in air ships and destroyers. They did not believe in the way of Jesus; they believed in the deceits of diplomacy, in the supremacy of force, and in the way of selfishness. And the Western powers continued the old practice when they came to making peace.

The picture is not all dark, however. There is a light that is breaking. More and more men are seeing the futility of the old way. The war makers and the hate breeders are not dead. The men in industry who see nothing but profits are still with us. But the terrible tuition

of these past years is bearing some fruit. Concede every charge of mistake and weakness, it nevertheless remains as a challenging fact: through these last years, without interruption, the nations of Europe, with some representation from other continents, have been meeting together for peaceful adjudication of differences and for coöperation in the common good. It meant something when Briand welcomed the first arrivals from Germany taking their seats in the League of Nations, when he spoke of the old way and the old days of warfare and hate, and then with a passion that admitted no doubt of sincerity, turned to Stresemann and said: "*C'est fini! C'est fini!*" (It is ended)! The world is waiting for light, and it can only come by the way of Jesus. That the same is true in industry is witnessed by a growing group of whose spirit the late Arthur Nash may be taken as illustration. What a challenge to the Church! We can appreciate the word of a great English bishop who declared that the Christian Church might well take a decade for a united study of the way in which the spirit of Jesus was to be applied to the social life of the world.

But not only in the realm of ideals and programs of life is this march of thought going on; there is a renewed interest to-day in the deeper

questions that belong to religion and faith. Men have been trying to live by bread alone; and that can never permanently satisfy. Just when the machine was ready to celebrate its triumph as the god of the age, a God that had created for us all a paradise of physical plenty and electrical convenience, just when we were ready to say, "Soul, thou hast many goods; eat, drink, and be merry," then the world about us began to break down amid the booming guns of the great war. And when we retreated to the world within we found that it was empty. It is the old story of the human heart unsatisfied.

Just when we are safest, there's a sunset touch,
A fancy from a flowerbell, some one's death,
A chorus ending from Euripides—

And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
As old and new at once as nature's self,

To rap and knock and enter in our soul.

Turn to the books that come, not from the-ologian alone, but from philosopher and scien-tist and man of letters, turn to the magazines or even the daily press; everywhere you find men raising the old and new questions with which religion has dealt. When the full tale of science is told, what then? Whence came the world that science describes and the order which appears in its laws? What does it all

mean? What may we believe? And are there resources of the spirit in which men may trust for help in this hour when all else has failed? And are there ideals that lie higher than mere prudence or shrewdness or social convention, ideals which have the right to command?

Let no one imagine, however, that in the midst of perfect silence men are waiting for the Church to speak her word. Quite the reverse. On every hand are raised the strident voices of conflicting creeds and philosophies that proffer the final answer to all man's questions. There are plenty of candidates for the place of messiah, as one of the chapters in this volume suggests. Nor let any man suppose that all that is needed is for the *ipse dixit* of the Church to be pronounced in order to have men accept her authority. That is, of course, not what we want even if we could have it, that men should hear an ancient creed and adopt it on authority. The faith that will save our day will be one of free and inner conviction. But there is no danger of our getting the other. The teaching ministry of to-day must face clearly certain facts which set the condition for her work. First is the fact that it must appeal to the mind and conscience of men. We may appeal to "the fathers" and

lay down our "fundamentals" till doomsday, but the pose of authority is having less and less weight. If we will only go far enough back in our search for the fathers, back to Paul and Jesus and the prophets, then we may learn to advantage their way, which was not an appeal to authorities or tradition, but the search for conviction aimed straight at mind and heart and conscience.

The teaching ministry, in the second place, must face squarely the problems raised by the new conditions of life and the results of the new knowledge in every sphere. That does not mean that we are to snatch at the latest hypothesis of science and proclaim it as unchanging truth. It does not mean that spiritual truth does not have its own basis of certainty. It does mean that truth is one, from whatever source it comes. It means that the believer in the God of truth must keep the eager, open mind as religiously as does the man of science. It means faith in the Spirit of truth as leading the Church to-day. Without such openness of mind and honesty of mind we cannot hold the thinking men of our day; and we do not deserve to, because without these we are not loyal to the God of truth.

But will not such a work of teaching stir up controversy? Talk about science and re-

ligion or the newer view of the Bible, touch upon child labor in a milling community or on principles of industrial justice, speak of race relations and of Christ's principle of the worth of human personality, and what will happen to the peace of the Church? But since when has that kind of peace been the great desideratum of the Church? There is a peace which means life, but there is likewise a peace that means disloyalty and cowardice and death. A teaching ministry does not mean a combative spirit, or a lack of tact and good sense. It means leading people and not belaboring them **or** bewildering them. But in the end, when it comes to truth which is needful for life, it means declaring the truth even if it disturbs the peace. Amos knew that conflict would come at Bethel, conflict with the acknowledged leaders of religion and with established ideas. Jeremiah had no illusions as to what was awaiting him from the hundred per cent patriots of his day when he proclaimed his "defeatist" message. John the Baptist became embroiled with the authorities. Jesus declared that he came to bring a sword. The apostles were met with vigorous opposition as those who were turning the world upside down. Luther and Wesley were not inviting controversy, but they did not, and could not,

avoid it. The Church will have no trouble if it stays with the crowd. It will get plaudits and support, but it will sacrifice leadership.

The time has come for the Church definitely and consciously to enter upon a revival of its teaching mission. The world waits for that which God has given it. The words of a modern economic writer and publicist, J. M. Keynes, are significant. "The events of the coming year will not be shaped by the deliberate acts of statesmen, but by the hidden currents flowing continually beneath the surface of political history, of which no one can predict the outcome. In one way only can we influence these hidden currents—by setting in motion those forces of instruction and imagination which change opinion. The assertion of truth, the unveiling of illusion, the dissipation of hate, the enlargement and instruction of men's hearts and minds, must be the means."

There went forth once upon the highways of an ancient empire a wandering preacher. Member of a despised race, disciple of a scorned faith, he had behind him no great institution, he bore no prestige, and he had only one gift in his hands. That gift was a message, a simple word of truth. But that message became a life that sprang up in men's hearts.

A new fellowship arose, an empire within an empire, and when at last decadent Rome passed away the new kingdom of faith and love endured. Wealth and numbers have come to the Church, it has its multiplied ministries; but its greatest gift is still its message, and its greatest weapon is still the word of truth.

II

THE USE OF THE BIBLE TO-DAY

BY FREDERICK CARL EISELEN

THE Christian Church has always assigned to the Bible a unique place in thought and life. This place the Bible came to occupy in the beginning, not because of any conscious effort on the part of the Church or the councils of the Church to make it a book of supreme authority, but rather because it proved itself in the experiences of men and the Church a literature of inherent, authoritative power.

The acceptance of the Bible as a book of unique beauty and power does not in itself determine what use may or should be made of the book. On this point different views have been and still are held. There is, first of all, the position which insists that all statements in the Bible, from beginning to end, whether they deal with religion, or morals, or history, or science, or any other subject, must be accepted as inerrant, infallible, and authoritative. The fullest expression of this position is found in the words of an English writer: "The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it, every

chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it (where are we to stop?), every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the word of God, not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike, the utterance of him that sitteth upon the throne, faultless, unerring, supreme."

While in theory this view of the Bible is still held by many, I know of no one who actually and consistently uses the book on the basis of this view. Modern investigators—scientists, historians, archæologists, or whatever line of research they may represent—have marshaled too many facts to permit any longer the use of the Bible as an infallible guide in matters of science and history. In the latter fields the writers did the best of which they were capable under the intellectual limitations of the age in which they lived; but, let it be remembered, in the words of Professor Ryle, "Scripture supplies no short cut for the intellect. Where man's intellectual powers may hope to attain to the truth, be it in the region of historical, scientific, or critical study, we have no warrant to expect an anticipation of results through the interposition of supernatural instruction in the letter of Scripture. . . . Scripture is divinely inspired, not to release men from

the toil of mental inquiry, but to lead and instruct their souls in things of eternal salvation."

The truth of the statement here made is fairly generally recognized; hence, the admission on the part of many lovers of the Bible that the book should not be used as a final authority in all things, but only as a final authority in matters of *faith and conduct*, faith in this case being defined as equivalent to belief. On the basis of this view the attitude toward the Bible is one of unquestioned acceptance and obedience in the realm of religion, theology, and morals. However, the student soon discovers difficulties. When he compares, for instance, the teaching concerning the character of God as found in some of the earlier portions of the Bible with that of Jesus, he instinctively hesitates to ascribe to the former the same authority which he gladly recognizes in the latter. The same is true regarding some of the specific commandments and rules of conduct found in different parts of the Bible. Christians, just because they are Christians, accept Jesus as the most perfect revelation of God and truth; consequently, with perfect consistency they claim the right to place the authority of Jesus above that of the Bible as a whole, and, consciously or unconsciously,

they judge everything in the Bible by what they conceive to be essentially the Christ standard.

This supreme position of Jesus the Christ is well described by W. N. Clarke: "He [Jesus Christ] has shown God as he is in his character and relations with men. He has represented life in its true meaning and opened to us the real way to genuine welfare and success in existence. What he has made known commends and proves itself as true by the manner in which it fits into the human scheme, meets human needs, and renders thought rational and life successful. God eternally is such a being as Jesus represents him to be; this is the heart of Christianity, to be apprehended, not first in thought, but first in life and love, and this is forever true." (*The Use of the Scriptures in Theology*, pages 51, 52.)

Is there a better way of using the Bible than that which thinks of it first of all in terms of external authority?

A few words should be added to what has been stated and implied in the preceding paragraphs concerning the proper *objective* in the use of the Bible. That the Bible contains sublime specimens of various types of literature is a comparatively recent discovery. This dis-

covery has inspired men to study the Bible for the purpose of gaining a better understanding and appreciation of its literary excellence. The Bible does indeed contain fine specimens of history, law, poetry, oratory, and, indeed, of practically every kind of literary composition. It has been well said that the Bible "is a literature which no age nor nation can equal or supersede, though every library in the world had remained unravaged and every teacher's truest words had been written down." Moreover, the full significance of biblical teaching can be understood only if proper regard is given to the literary form of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, the books in the collection were not written and collected primarily as specimens of literature, but for the purpose of recording and interpreting divine revelations; and in the pursuit of a narrow literary study, insufficient weight may be given to this primary purpose.

From the point of view of history also, the Bible occupies and will continue to occupy an important position; therefore, the effort to gather from the biblical books a better understanding of the historical material they contain represents a perfectly legitimate objective. Again it must be remembered, however, that the biblical writers were interested

primarily, not in writing history or furnishing sources of historical information, but rather in interpreting history on the basis of a vital, irresistible belief in the reality of a personal and good God working out his eternal purpose. They were convinced and were trying to teach others that God was revealing himself in creation and in all the phenomena of nature, that his hand may be seen in human history, be it the history of individuals or of nations, and that he was present in a special way in the history of the chosen people, Israel.

The New Testament was written for the purpose of showing that God was in Christ Jesus; that the power of God expressed itself in his person, life, work, death, and resurrection. It was God in Jesus the Christ that gave victory to the early Christian movement and resulted in its spread to practically the entire then known world. The doctrinal writings of the New Testament represent attempts on the part of men living in close communion with God and Jesus Christ to explain this manifestation of God in its practical bearing upon the problems of early Christians and of the early Christian Church. From this it follows that it can hardly be considered an adequate objective to seek an understanding of

the historical material furnished in the biblical books.

If the primary purpose of the biblical writers was to record and interpret the manifold revelations of God as seen and apprehended by them, the primary objective in the use of the Bible should be to understand these revelations of God, to know him, his nature, his character, his will, his purpose, and, by becoming acquainted with these, to bring God nearer to us and us nearer to him in a sympathetic appreciation of his purpose and a loving consecration of our all to coöperation with him in the achievement of this purpose.

To achieve this objective is not as simple and easy as some seem to think. Since the Bible is a book written many centuries ago by men of an entirely different race, of different modes of thinking and expression, the greater part in a language foreign to any of the languages with which we are ordinarily familiar, dealing with the profoundest subjects with which the human mind can grapple, with subjects that directly or indirectly are related to all kinds of knowledge—since the Bible is such a book—who can expect to understand its teaching through the kind of superficial read-

ing or study that alone is given to it by multitudes of Christians at the present time?

One of the first requirements to assure results in the use of the Bible is the adoption of a proper *method* of study. Experience has shown that the earnest Bible student receives the greatest help from the use of the so-called historical method which enables him to discover most completely the thought and message which the authors of the books sought to express. Only after the original meaning is adequately understood, appreciated, and appropriated can there be made with any degree of success an effort to apply this truth to the personal, present-day needs of the student or of those to whom he may seek to minister. The historical method means the study of the Bible by books. The Bible is a library consisting of many books; these were written and published separately; each has its own meaning and purpose; hence, in order to understand and appreciate the whole collection, it is necessary to discover the aim and value of each constituent part.

A few simple suggestions may be added regarding method of procedure. Before taking up the detailed study of the contents, the student should make an effort to discover something regarding the origin and literary history

of the book. When was it written, by whom, where, under what circumstances, for what purpose? Answers to these and similar questions, which may be found in part at least in the book itself, are essential if the message itself is to be fully understood. But this part of the inquiry represents, not the ultimate goal, but simply a means of attaining the goal, which is the appreciation of the message contained in the book.

Turning to the study of the book itself, the student should acquire, first of all, a fairly well-defined general notion of its contents. This he can do by reading the book carefully, at one sitting, and reading it thus several times; for no book can be mastered if it is read always only in fragments. He then should write down the general theme and substance of the book, to be followed by another reading or two, on the basis of which the impressions written down may be corrected. This process should be continued until the student has secured a fair knowledge of the book as a whole. The student should next trace the logical arrangement of the contents. It would be preferable to have the student prepare his own analysis; but if he experiences too much difficulty he may consult as a starting point an analysis found in some good Bible help. He must not

rest content, however, until he has checked it on the basis of his own study. With this analysis in mind he should proceed to master the book, section by section, through a careful study of each word and sentence. While it is advisable in this study to use commentaries and other helps, the student must never assign first place to them; the Bible must be the basis of study; other books should be used only as a means toward the better understanding of the thought of the biblical writer. This prepares the way for a topical study, bringing together the fragments of teaching in different parts of the book for the purpose of arranging and systematizing the teaching of the book as a whole. Having thus acquired a knowledge of the book's message, the student is prepared to apply it to his own life and conduct and to the lives of those whom he seeks to serve, so as to furnish new ideals and new impulses for a truly Christian life.

A second essential factor in Bible study is the proper attitude of mind and heart, the spirit in which the student approaches the Bible. In the first place, he who seeks to obtain the best results must approach the Bible in the spirit of a *learner*; he must be humble and childlike, ready to receive instruction. Again, he must approach the Bible in a *spirit*

of open-mindedness, willing to receive the truth, though that truth may be contrary to long-cherished notions. Moreover, he must enter upon the study in a *spirit of expectancy*. The investigation of any subject may be approached in any one of three attitudes of mind as to results. There may be a spirit of uncertainty and indifference, or a spirit of nonexpectancy, or a spirit of expectancy and assurance that the efforts will not be in vain. Only the student who approaches the study of the Bible in the last-mentioned attitude and spirit will see the most helpful results. There must also be a *spirit of determination and perseverance*. The richest truths of the Bible are not found by one who is easily tired. Bible study demands unwearied perseverance. Another essential requisite is a *spirit of prayerfulness*. There are sayings in the Bible hard to be understood, for the natural man receiveth not the things of God; but the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. This is the Spirit that is to lead into all truth. Bible study can never be what it should be unless the student approaches the sacred Book in a spirit of prayer for the illumination of his heart and mind by the Spirit of truth. Once more, there must be a spirit of *responsiveness*. By this I mean more than willingness to be taught.

Sooner or later the student finds that the truths he discovers impose upon him certain duties that appeal to his conscience. Now, scientific truth is most readily mastered by practical application. The same is true of moral and religious truth. He that willeth to do is the one that will learn the most. Whenever a truth is found as the result of Bible study, it should be accepted not merely as an abstract truth, but as a part of the inner life to find expression in conduct.

Such a study is bound to produce *results*. It would be easy to adduce thousands of testimonials to support the statement of the apostle (2 Tim. 3: 15-17), that "the sacred writings are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work." In other words, the Scriptures have proved themselves able to inspire a personal faith in Jesus, the Christ, to furnish a knowledge of the things of God, and to prepare for efficient service, the three elements that enter into the abundant life advocated and illustrated by Jesus himself. And what may

be said of the Bible as a source of consolation? How many in the hour of sorrow, grief, and bereavement have turned to the Scriptures and there found hope and consolation? No wonder that Renan calls the Bible "the great book of consolation for humanity."

The Bible has become a book of such extraordinary significance for several reasons. In the first place, it presents, not indeed the only, but surely the most comprehensive vision of God and the deepest insight into the will and purpose of God that may be found anywhere: God, spirit, person, with a clearly defined moral character, in his fatherly mercy ready to enter into covenant relations with men, loving man and desiring to be loved by him, his anger aroused by sin, but gracious toward the repenting sinner. Moreover, because he is such a God he yearns for a state of society in which human relationships will be a reflection of his own character. Again, the Bible reveals remarkably keen insight into human nature. The Bible has been called the "family album of the Holy God." We might liken it rather to a picture gallery. What a variety! Everywhere we see them, flesh and blood. Why is it that they so impress us? Is it not because the pictures are so true to

human nature that in spite of the difference in time, place, and circumstances they serve even us as mirrors? In studying different character sketches we may learn two lessons, one, how men with a sublime vision of God lived and should live, and the other, how those without such a vision lived and should not live. In addition, the Bible teaches, as no other book does, how this vision of God may become the experience of men, and how the power of this experience may be felt in human life. What an inspiration it is to trace the workings of God through the centuries for the purpose of making himself known and thus drawing all men unto him in loving obedience, and then to watch the consummation of it all in Jesus Christ, through whom all may know God and come into vital relations with him. And, finally, all these truths are presented in a manner that even the simplest, provided he is willing to make the effort, can understand. Truly, the Bible is "the one book wherein for thousands of years the spirit of man has found life and nourishment and a response to whatever was deepest in his heart." If rightly used, this is what the Bible will prove itself to be to the modern reader and student.

Instead of emphasizing, then, in connection with the use of the Bible terms like "iner-

rancy," "infallibility," "final authority," it would seem to be better to accept the language of the Psalmist: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and light unto my path." The most promising use of the Bible is its use as a light, a guide, an inspiration. Being brought face to face with God in the lives of men in Bible times we can learn how God may become real to us in our own time. Learning what men enjoying intimate personal fellowship with God in ancient times thought concerning God and the other great verities of their faith, we in this day can receive help and guidance and inspiration in thinking about these great truths upon the basis of our own personal experience of God in Jesus Christ. Seeing how these men lived under the inspiration of the consciousness of the presence of God, we may learn how in this day and age we may live in all our human relationships under the inspiration which comes from the consciousness of our heart union with God and our thought concerning him and the other great truths of our Christian faith. Understanding the ideas and ideals of the kingdom of God expressed in the words of ancient heroes of the faith, we can appreciate more fully the significance of the gospel of the kingdom in our own day and coöperate more in-

telligently in the efforts to make it a reality in the present world.

The Bible, when used in this way, does not lose its significance. Indeed, it does not lose in any real sense its authority. On the contrary, its practical value becomes greatly enhanced. It becomes indeed a book of life, a book of inspiration, a book of power. Its real authority lies in its inherent worth. It inspires us to live as a child of God should live, because it grips us, it awakens a response within us, it convinces us by its own spiritual quality that it is in very deed the truth of God. Who is there among sincere users of the Bible that cannot make these words of Coleridge his own? "Need I say that I have met everywhere more or less copious sources of truth and power and purifying impulses, that I have found words for my inmost thoughts, songs for my joy, utterances for my hidden griefs, and pleadings for my shame and feebleness? In short, whatever finds me, bears witness for itself that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit, even from the same Spirit which, remaining in itself, yet regenerateth all other powers, and in all ages entering into holy souls, maketh them friends of God and prophets."

III

THE PROPHET AS A PREACHER

BY FREDERICK CARL EISELEN

THE supreme need of men to-day is a vital knowledge of God. By this I mean something more than an intellectual assent to the proposition, "there is a God." I have in mind rather knowledge that springs from experience, knowledge which makes God a real factor in human living. Religious leaders in all ages have recognized and emphasized this need in their own day. Turning back to the Hebrew prophets, we discover the conviction repeatedly expressed that it was lack of an adequate knowledge of Jehovah that furnished the key to the people's apostasy and wickedness. Consequently prophetic activity and preaching focused on the effort to lead people into a more satisfactory conception and experiential knowledge of their God. Note, for instance, the expectation of Hosea concerning the future: "I will betroth thee unto me forever. Yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in justice, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness." Then, as the climax of his hope he exclaims: "Thou

shalt know Jehovah." (Hos. 2: 19, 20.) In other words, the expectation of the prophet centered in the reestablishment of a fellowship of life and love with Jehovah, based on a vital knowledge of him as a loving and ever-present God.

The sublime religious lyrics found in the book of Psalms show that during the centuries following the preaching of the great prophets many individuals within the Jewish community truly enjoyed and practiced the presence of God. Troubled by doubt and perplexed the psalmist cries out:

Whom have I in heaven *but thee?*

And there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee.

My flesh and my heart faileth;

But God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever.

But during these same centuries, at least so far as official religion was concerned, God was farther and farther removed from the everyday affairs of men. Finally Jesus came and revived in the hearts of men faith in God as a constant companion. Note, for instance, the conversation reported in John 14: 6-10: "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one cometh unto the Father, but by me. If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also; from henceforth

ye know him and have seen him. Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself; but the Father abiding in me doeth his works." How well Jesus succeeded in this undertaking is suggested in the words of William Newton Clarke: "God is eternally such a being as Jesus represents him to be."

The individual who enjoys this experience of God inevitably becomes aware of a new outlook upon life, of new ideals, of new standards of living. Consider as an illustration the inaugural vision of the prophet Isaiah. One day while worshipping in the temple he had a vision of the Lord sitting upon his throne, surrounded by his heavenly courtiers. He also heard the song of the heavenly host:

Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts!
The whole earth is full of his glory!

What were the first words to fall from the prophet's lips after he had heard the heavenly

chorus? "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips." A deeper realization of Jehovah's presence and holiness created for Isaiah a new standard by which to judge his life. A similar experience came to Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9: 1-19), and the results were the same, as clearly brought out in the autobiographical sketch found in Philippians 3.

Again, a vital experience of God furnishes the mightiest incentive and impulse to live up to the heightened ideals. The estimate expressed by Jesus is none too high: "This is life eternal, that they might know thee." The far-reaching influence of this experience of God is indicated also in the words of Professor Rauschenbusch: "The all-pervading life of God is the ground of the spiritual oneness of the race and of our hope for its closer fellowship in the future. . . . The Christian God has been a breaker of barriers from the first. All who have a distinctively Christian experience of God are committed to the expansion of human fellowship and to the overthrow of barriers."

Over against the fact of this need stands the tremendous fact that throughout the centuries and millenniums God has shown himself not

only willing, but passionately anxious to become a dynamic presence in the hearts and lives of men. The very story of creation, by its statement that man is created in the image of God, suggests the endowment of man with powers and capacities which make it possible for him to have intercourse and communion with the Divine. Furthermore, from the beginning until now God has responded to the outreachings of men by revealing himself and his purpose in the hope that by these revelations he might help man to realize his full capacities.

In his attempt to reach man God uses divers methods and means. God reveals himself in the events of history, whether it be the history of individuals or of nations. To many devout persons God speaks very distinctly through the outward acts of worship. There are thousands of earnest and sincere Christians in Churches using an elaborate ritual to whom this ritual is not mere form; it is a means of blessing and grace through which God reveals himself to their souls. Again, God selects certain persons especially well qualified to hear his voice. To these he reveals himself in a variety of ways, and then he commissions them as ambassadors to declare him and his will to the people who may be less capable or less privileged. The belief in this method of revelation is the philo-

sophical basis for the offices of the Christian preacher and the Christian religious teacher.

This brings us directly to the consideration of the prophet as a preacher, for it is the same philosophy that underlies the prophetic movement. What, then, was the fundamental task and function of the Hebrew prophet as a preacher? There has been, and still is, a somewhat widespread notion that these men delighted to revel in the future, and that their primary function was to announce or predict future events, especially those centering around the person, life, and activity of Jesus Christ. However, a careful study of the prophets and their writings makes it clear that this is a one-sided and erroneous view. True, etymology does not aid us in determining the conception implied in the Hebrew noun translated "prophet," for the root meaning of the word is doubtful. But whatever may have been the original meaning of the word, it certainly does not necessarily imply the idea of prediction. A study of Old Testament usage leads to more definite results. Take, for instance, the two relevant passages in the book of Exodus: "And Jehovah said unto Moses, See, I have made thee as God to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet . . . and

he shall be thy spokesman to the people, and it shall come to pass that he shall be to thee a mouth, and thou shalt be to him as God." Evidently the prophet was looked upon as a man who spoke for, or in the name of, some one, especially in the name of the Deity. Consequently, the prophets whose writings have been preserved in the Old Testament may be described as ambassadors of 'Jehovah, whose task, similar to that of the modern preacher, was to make known the character, will, and purpose of God to the people in their own day and generation.

A message delivered by men of this type might be expected to deal with the immediate needs and problems of the people to whom the prophets were speaking in the name of Jehovah; and a study of the prophetic books confirms this assumption. The denunciations, warnings, exhortations, threats of ruin, and even the promises of the prophets are all addressed directly and specifically to the men in their own congregations. True, there are more or less frequent references to the future as well as to the past, but a study of the relevant passages will soon convince the reader that both past and future are referred to solely for the purpose of making the appeal to the present more effective.

The prophets believed that their God had a vital interest in every department of life, whether people called it political or social or industrial or moral or religious. With their sublime vision of God they knew no sphere of life where the presence of Jehovah might not be felt or where the battle for righteousness might not be fought, and it was the sole ambition of these ambassadors and interpreters of God to fight this battle until the entire national life should be regenerated, until worship should be so pure, commerce so clean, and politics so unselfish and honest, that all might be offered as a holy and acceptable service to Jehovah.

Strong in this conception of their responsibility, the prophets, as preachers, became patient and painstaking teachers of religious truth. Conceiving the great need of the hour to be a more adequate knowledge of their God, all of them focused their attention upon this one point. Each of the prophets emphasized that phase of the divine character which meant most to him in his own experience and life. Thus, in the eighth century Amos emphasized righteousness; Hosea, loving-kindness; Isaiah, holiness. The latter looked upon righteousness, loving-kindness, and all other divine qualities simply as the expression of this inner holiness which was, so to speak, the heart of

the Godhead. It was the direct result of the prophetic preaching that the religion of the Hebrews came to possess a God concept sufficiently high to serve as an essential element even in the idea of God proclaimed by Jesus.

The prophets, however, were religious teachers not only with respect to the God concept, but also regarding the service acceptable to this holy and righteous God. The prophetic teaching on this subject is essentially a reflection of the teaching concerning the divine character. To a holy and righteous God a cold, heartless, formal service, without a spirit of true devotion and the backing of a righteous life, must be an abomination. With the prophets religion consisted not in the performance of certain ceremonial acts, though such acts might have their proper place, nor in the acceptance of a certain creed, though fixed beliefs might be of considerable importance. With them religion was primarily a matter of heart and life. Hence they were convinced that the divine requirements had to do, first of all, with life and conduct, life in all its aspects and relations.

As a means of encouragement the prophets further explained to their hearers the eternal purpose which God was working out with them and through them. The present corruption

of the people made judgment inevitable, but from the judgment they saw emerge a redeemed and purified remnant. This redeemed remnant would form the nucleus of the new kingdom of God during the Messianic era. Conditions within this kingdom the prophets expected to be an expression of the character of Jehovah, who would be in the midst of his people. The prophets also looked forward to the coming of an ideal ruler, who would govern the new kingdom in the name and in the strength of Jehovah. The kingdom, a kingdom of peace and purity and righteousness, was to endure forever.

In addition, the prophets were bold and fearless preachers of right living and of a righteous social order. The Hebrews have always been looked upon as the religious teachers of the world. But it is equally significant that they were also the ethical teachers of men; they were the first to teach that the supreme goal of life is righteousness. This position as ethical and moral teachers they owe chiefly to the persistent labors of the prophets. It is not difficult to find any number of passages which reveal these men as practical, social-minded preachers of right living and whole-hearted champions of the common people. It may be sufficient

to quote two or three passages: "Thy princes are unprincipled and companions of thieves; every one loveth bribes, and chaseth after fees; they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them." (Isa. 1: 23.) "Hear this, I pray you, ye heads of the house of Jacob, and rulers of the house of Israel, that abhor justice and pervert all equity. They build up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with iniquity. The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money." But the prophets were not content with denouncing present abuses. They were equally anxious to hold before the people lofty social ideals, which they constantly urged their hearers to attain.

In the passages quoted and many others the social message of the prophets is most definite and specific. However, these specific denunciations and exhortations may be traced back to a few simple and easily discovered principles. It is these principles which need to be learned and emphasized by the men of to-day who would be to the twentieth century what the ancient prophets were to their times. Do the following passages have no meaning to the preacher of the social gospel to-day?

Let justice roll down as waters,
And righteousness as a perennial stream.

I desire goodness and not sacrifice
And the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.

Wash you, make you clean;
Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes;
Cease to do evil; learn to do well;
Seek justice, relieve the oppressed;
Judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.

Or the greatest passage of them all:

He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what
doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, and to love
kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God.

Again, as prophets and preachers these men of old entered the field of politics and international relations. This they did not for selfish reasons, but, first, because they believed that God was interested in the political life of the nation, and, second, because they saw that on account of the faithlessness of their political leaders the people needed guidance from those who were inspired by unselfish, ethical motives. The prophets never ceased to advocate policies that were based upon principles of justice and equity. Graft, bribery, exorbitant fees, widespread in those early days, were bitterly denounced by the prophets of old. Faithless officials did not escape their condemnation.

The prophets were interested also in international politics. The mission of Israel was world wide. In order to carry out this mission the nation must be careful about its relations to other peoples. These the prophets jealously guarded. But the prophets in their international interests were not simply shrewd schemers, or, as has been suggested, the tools of foreign nations. They were statesmen, because, first of all, they were prophets seeking to apply the will and purpose of their God to the political and international affairs of the age.

All this means that the activity of the prophets as preachers was very comprehensive. Life to them was a unit, and they were convinced that since the interest of God extended to all affairs of life, their own interest as representatives of God should be equally comprehensive. With all this interest in present-day needs and present-day improvements, again and again they turned from the present to the future, and, inspired by a sublime faith, they penetrated the veil hiding the future and anticipated the glorious era when the kingdom of God, a kingdom of righteousness and peace under the rule of an ideal king, would be established upon earth.

The modern preacher may learn much from the activities and messages of the Hebrew prophets. Their full significance, however, cannot be appreciated without giving attention also to their personal characters and qualifications. What the prophets were furnished the inspiration and dynamic for what they said and did. The sanity, tact, and common sense of these men were worthy of note. They did not lose their heads, nor did they injure the cause of Jehovah through lack of skill or legitimate shrewdness. Note the tact with which Amos prepared the way for his denunciation of Israel (chapters 1 and 2); or the matchless skill of Isaiah, illustrated, for example, in the parable of the vineyard (5: 1-7); or the fearless rebuke of David by Nathan (2 Sam. 12: 1-7).

It is perfectly evident that these ancient prophet-preachers were men of vital religious experience. They had more than an intellectual grasp of the truth they proclaimed. They saw God and lived in personal communion and fellowship with him. As a result they understood the divine ideals of righteousness and were in better position rightly to estimate the condition of their contemporaries. The truth took hold of their hearts and lives, and only because they saw and felt and experienced and

lived did they burn with a divine enthusiasm to make their contemporaries see the same visions, experience the same life, and realize the same ideals.

The prophets were deeply conscious of a divine call. "The lion hath roared," says Amos; "who will not fear? The Lord Jehovah hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" Isaiah is conscious of the command: "Go!" Jeremiah has heard the divine voice: "I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations." Moreover, they proved splendidly loyal to their call and their convictions. Hardship could not dim their enthusiasm, opposition could not quench their ardor, and danger of death itself could not swerve them from their purpose.

The prophets were inspired by the conviction that they had a definite responsibility regarding the problems of the age and their solution. They could not transfer responsibility to their fellows; nor could they place their trust entirely in external or supernatural powers. They knew that their own faculties and powers were not superseded by powers from without, and that they must make diligent use of their own powers. At the same time they were firmly convinced that they could achieve results only through real divine coöperation.

The prophets were holy men, holy in both

senses in which the word is used in the Old Testament. In the first place, they were morally pure; their motives and lives were pure and in harmony with the highest ideals they proclaimed. They endeavored to reflect in thought, word, and deed the character of Jehovah as apprehended by them. They were holy also in the sense that they were entirely devoted to Jehovah and to his service. He and his cause had first claim at all times; everything else must retire into the background.

The prophets had a sense of freedom to strike out along new lines and to blaze new trails. They did not despise the past; on the contrary, they harked back to the past and gladly accepted from it that which was good and promised to be permanent. However, when the method and technique of the past were no longer effective, they did not hesitate to devise better ways of doing the work of their God. Moreover, again and again they came to realize that the beliefs and doctrines of the past were inadequate to meet the experience of the present; that unless they were rethought in the light of present-day experience Jehovah religion would be in danger. In such crises they did not hesitate to move forward; and it is to these ventures of faith

that we owe the discovery and formulation of those great religious and ethical truths which have become the prized possession of the human race.

To sum up: The prophet-preachers of the Hebrews owe their permanent influence in large measure to certain well-defined personal, moral, and spiritual qualifications. They were men of tact and common sense, men dominated by a vital experience of God, the conviction of a divine call and a sense of responsibility for results; they were holy men who, inspired by a consciousness of personal communion with God, were not afraid to make new ventures of faith. Such must be the modern prophet-preachers who would lead their people through the crises of the present and future. The principal task of these men was to preserve, develop, spiritualize, and encourage the practice of religion in all human relationships. And is not this the task of the modern preacher? It is safe to say that without the faithful work of these ancient prophets Israel never could have become the prophetic nation which prepared the way for Him who was in an unique way the spokesman, the interpreter, the revealer of the Father, even Jesus Christ our Lord and Master.

IV

WHAT THE OLD TESTAMENT GAVE TO THE NEW

BY LESLIE ELMER FULLER

THE significance of the Old Testament is not to be judged by what it inherited, but rather by what it contributed to the race. Too frequently biblical discussions have been concerned with the incidental to the exclusion of the principal contributions of religious development. There are numerous evidences of the survival of ancient Semitic beliefs and practices, such as primitive ideas of deity, old forms of worship, bits of legend and folklore; but the Old Testament cannot be judged by the presence of these survivals. The old Testament represents centuries of growth and change, and its permanent values must be gathered from the main trends of its religious development.

The study of the Old Testament reveals some remarkable examples of its capacity for growth and development. Marvel of all marvels is that it contains so much of the dynamic and so little comparatively of the static element. It is not a product of systems of thought

but rather an outgrowth of religious experience in close contact with everyday life. The ability of its leaders is seen in their sensible views of the past and a recognition of the great needs of the present. There are numerous examples even of different opinions held by men of the same period, such as in the case of Isaiah and Micah.

What are some of the permanent values of the Old Testament? What are some of the main trends of the religious development, especially those particular elements that are passed on to the New Testament? The answer to these questions will be summarized in a selection of a few of the more important features.

We begin with the central thought of religion, the concept of God. From the standpoint of religious development the Old Testament might well be called a series of attempts to find God. And how frequently we have endeavored to reconcile the earlier attempts with the later ones! There are numerous examples of anthropomorphic and nationalistic concepts, but these are in no wise comparable with the more universal and moral conceptions of the prophets and the writers of the post-exilic period. The significant fact is that

Israel outgrew so many of these earlier concepts.

Several important elements in the Old Testament conception of God are carried over into later religious development. The first of these is a profound belief in the reality and existence of God and the sense of his intimate relationship with human life. It is almost an axiom of Semitic thinking never to question the existence of God. God's relations with the world and man are vividly conceived in the most intimate and personal terms. God is the prime mover in all cosmic and human affairs.

Another line of evidence that indicates the capacity for growth in the Old Testament is the increasing moralization of the character of God. It receives its greatest development at the hands of the prophets. God possesses the qualities of justice, holiness, righteousness, and loving-kindness. God punishes according to moral standards, and his judgment falls alike on his own chosen folk and on other nations. The great day of the Lord becomes a day in which the character of God is to be vindicated; sin is to be punished, whether found at home or abroad.

Another contribution of the Old Testament conception of God is seen in the ever-widening area of God's control. The beginning is the

ancient Semitic conception of divinities located in mountains, trees, sacred stones, and water courses. There are a few of these survivals in the Old Testament. But, beginning with a God of Sinai, we see next a God of a confederation of tribes, then a God of Palestine, and finally a God of the hosts of the heavens, the whole world order, and all the nations of mankind.

The ethical developments of the Old Testament form the essential foundations of the New. At times it is decidedly tribal and nationalistic in scope and outlook, as seen, for example, in the law codes of Deuteronomy. At other times its ethics have a certain utilitarian or even selfish value as seen in the morals of the wise men, the Book of Proverbs being a good illustration. Wisdom in these sections is a kind of individual shrewdness that finds what is to one's advantage and avoids what is harmful. But this is not the whole story. The lofty social ethics we will consider later. Here should be noted the significance of the close relation between morals and religion. The ethical principles of the Old Testament are justified by religious experience and enforced by religious sanctions. It is this close relationship between ethics and religion that

enabled the founders of the law codes to introduce a note of freedom. It is this element of freedom that made it possible for the Jew to live under the Law yet at the same time to develop some of the finest expressions of individual religious life. This accounts for the production of such writings as Job, Jonah, Ruth, and many of the late Psalms, while the people were under the domination of the Law. The late apocalyptic book, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, one of the highest expressions of ethical development in Judaism, was produced under the same circumstances. The value of this for the New Testament is readily seen when it is noted that the motivation of Jesus's moral principles is found in his concept of God and of the coming rule of God on earth.

Another notable contribution lies in the insistence on the supremacy of the spiritual over the external in man's relation to God. The beginning of this movement is found with the prophets. It is not true to say that the prophets are opposed to all forms and institutions of religion. They accept the institutions of their day—sacrifice, ritual, and the other prescriptions of the law. They are opposed to their misuse and to the substitution of the externals for a more personal and ethical re-

lationship to God and one's fellow men. The institution of sacrifice, for example, is bitterly attacked when it means the subordination or neglect of the higher values of social justice and loyalty to God. The value of this heritage for the New Testament is self-evident, and at the same time it furnishes the key for a more intelligent understanding of Jesus's relations to the institutions of his day. Jesus is loyal to the temple, the law, and the Sabbath, but he is opposed to a use in which they fail to serve mankind. The law is to be fulfilled, but not to the exclusion of the weightier matters. It is not the abolition of the institution, but the recognition of a new sense of proportion and a higher standard of values.

Interesting is the Old Testament teaching as to the worth of the individual. It was a doctrine that came through long years of growth and struggle. For many centuries the rights of the individual were wholly merged in the welfare of the group. A single man, or even a small group, could suffer, but as long as the solidarity and integrity of the nation were not impaired, the problem of suffering was not felt. As long as this group idea was paramount, Isaiah's doctrines of the inviolability of Jerusalem and the remnant were direct corollaries. The prophets' program of morali-

zation was the force that leavened the lump and brought the individual more and more to the front. In the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel we have the first clear-cut lines of individualism. Man is alone responsible for his sins. The nation may fail, Jerusalem may be destroyed, but their destruction does not involve the loss of God. Now for the first time individual suffering becomes a problem apart from the continued existence of the nation. The lofty heights of individualistic piety are made possible. Thus in the late postexilic period, the problem of suffering becomes a real problem as seen in some of the psalms and in the Book of Job. The individual can now stand alone, with a value in his own right. One of the highest outreaches of this, from a moral angle, is seen in the thirty-first chapter of Job. The value of this idea of individualism for a later period is seen in the fine examples of the prayer life and the devotional spirit of the intertestamental period and the New Testament.

The social aspect of Old Testament ethics is of supreme value. The note of democracy is one of the basic principles of the Old Testament. The ancient Nazirite is the first of a line of protestants against signs of social dis-

integration. He voiced his protest in the total abstinence from wine. The Rechabites are another group protesting by a refusal to cultivate the soil or to live in houses. They saw no correction for the social wrongs of their day except by a return to the freedom and democracy of the desert. The most notable expression of this democratic spirit appears with the Hebrew prophets, ever close to the heart of the people. They courageously become the champions of the rights of the poor and the oppressed. They never waver in their denunciations of the privileged classes that fail to respect the rights of the common man. At the risk of their own personal safety they do not hesitate to oppose entrenched wrong. Hence their fierce denunciation of all acts of oppression and violence, their condemnation of land monopoly and of unjust discrimination against the poor landowner. They look forward to a time when all men will treat one another with loving-kindness and justice, and when the least and the poorest shall be insured their individual rights, especially in ownership of the land.

This same note of social concern for the common man is seen in the religious festivals and sacred seasons of Israel. One of the underlying elements in the institution of the Sab-

bath is the note of social welfare and humanitarian interest, surcease from labor for the benefit of the hard-working peasant. The social and humanitarian aspects of the Book of Deuteronomy carry on much of the same spirit of the prophets, wherein a merciful and a more considerate treatment of slaves, captive women, children, and dependent classes in general is enjoined. Many of its laws are safeguards for the cause of the poor against a possible repetition of the oppression of the privileged classes. The principles that underlie the social teachings of the Old Testament reappear in the New and are a permanent heritage of Christianity.

The rise of a world outlook is the result of a long contest with the old tribal or nationalistic view of the world. Its victory is by no means complete; it never plays more than a minor rôle. The bulk of the Old Testament writers are particularistic in their attitude toward the outside world, believing in the destruction of all hostile Gentile groups and in some cases in the total annihilation of the Gentile world. Here again it is the prophets whose ethical emphasis furnishes the basis for the appearance of the universalistic tendency. The old tribal view dies hard just because it is so firm-

ly intrenched in Semitic thinking. But the significant thing about the Old Testament at this point is not the persistency of the particularistic view, but rather that some one dared to build over against this view the beginnings of a larger and truer conception of the world order.

The first expressions of this larger view of other nations are imperfect. In the pre-prophetic days Israel is punished as a nation in a collective way. This collective punishment gives way gradually to a more personal and moral idea of punishment. But long after the prophets apply this more moral theory within the nation of Israel, the outside nations are still visited collectively with penalty. In many cases their sins are not specified, they are punished just because they are foreign nations, or because they oppose the onward march of the chosen race. This collective treatment of foreign nations shows some signs of breaking down in late Old Testament sections and again in the late literature of Judaism.

The first evidence in the Old Testament of a consideration of the future welfare of the Gentiles appears in Jeremiah. It appears again in Isaiah 40-55, wherein the salvation of the Gentiles is indicated. These expressions of

the larger outlook are reënforced in the Book of Ruth and the Book of Jonah. Outside of the Old Testament canon the apocalyptic Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs carries on this universalistic trend.

We turn in closing to the Old Testament teaching on the kingdom of God. The prophets are primarily preachers of righteousness for their own day and generation. They possess a fine philosophy of history, wherein God is closely associated with past and future events. They never lose sight of the golden age to come, the kingdom of God, or, exactly stated, the rule of God. Much has been said about the limitations of the Old Testament conception of the kingdom of God. Too much emphasis has been placed on its nationalistic features with Israel at the center, its materialistic aspects, its restored fertility of the land, its return of private ownership, and its promise of enduring prosperity.

Although a semi-moral conception at first, the Old Testament idea of the kingdom of God becomes one of the most potent conceptions in the background of the New Testament. There are several phases of this thought that are carried over into the New Testament. The first is the conception of the kingdom as

a theocracy. God is the sole ruler, and even if a Messiah figure appears, he is a subordinate figure to God. Another phase is the spiritual transformation of the world and the regeneration of mankind. The figure of the Messiah is still another important feature. All of these factors played a very important part in the development of New Testament thought.

V

WHAT HAPPENED BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENTS

BY LESLIE ELMER FULLER

IT is still a popular belief among Christian people that the period between the Old and New Testaments was a period of silence, an age barren of any historical and social movements of significance, and with no literary productions worthy of the name. The few books studied were branded as forgeries, lacking in originality and merit. Men saw in the age no expressions of vital religious experience, no worthy men of God, no voice of the prophet.

To a large number of Bible students, however, the period between the Testaments is becoming one of the major fields of research. Some of the most important results of biblical scholarship have been attained in this field of New Testament backgrounds. They have been derived largely from a study of contemporary history, Roman political and social systems, and various phases of Hellenistic culture with its languages, its literatures, its religions, and its systems of thought. But the most significant contributions have come from

the study of the inner life of Judaism, of its literature and religion in Palestine and in Hellenistic centers. The results in this latter field are now well assured, and they form one of a series of indispensable aids in the interpretation of the New Testament.

The purpose of this chapter is to give a brief summary of the principal contributions made by the study of the Jewish backgrounds of this period. These contributions will be considered from three viewpoints—the historical, the literary, and the religious. From the historical standpoint, the period between the Testaments is one of the most important in Judaism. We turn first to the Jewish dispersion.

The widespread dispersion of the Jews to all parts of the Hellenistic world represents one of the most unique events in history. The high tide of this migration of the Jews falls well within the bounds of this period. Driven forth by a desire for more fertile lands, they were attracted by the opportunities of residence in Hellenistic cities, the exhilaration and freedom of Greek life, and later on by the rights of free Roman citizenship. Wherever they wandered they increased greatly in numbers and made every effort to retain their racial

integrity. One of the burning issues of the Jews of the dispersion was the retention of their religious beliefs; and as a direct result of their religious needs, the synagogue, the most important institution in Judaism, came into being. Large numbers of the Jews drifted away from the faith of their fathers, but a still larger number continued to pay their temple tax to Jerusalem, and at the same time to refer all matters of religious concern to the authorities in Palestine. It is one of the world's superb examples of fine loyalty and religious solidarity. The significance of the Jewish dispersion is readily seen in connection with early Christianity, when it is considered that Paul was raised and trained in one of the synagogues of the dispersion. Further, one of the contributing causes of the rapid spread of Christianity in the Hellenistic world was the presence of these Jewish communities throughout the Mediterranean basin.

We note next the relation of the Jew and the Greek. There were some points of mutual attraction between them. The Greek was greatly attracted by the purity and simplicity of the worship of the Jew and the absence of idolatry. The Jew was attracted by the freedom and the lack of restraint of Greek life. But the points of difference in the two races

were bound to bring about a clash of the two nationalities or two cultures. The Greek could never understand the apparent stubbornness of the Jew in his prohibition of the use of swine's flesh and his refusal to fight on the Sabbath, while the Jew in turn viewed with alarm the "unclean" philosophy of the Greek. The immediate occasion for the clash came in the persistent policy of Antiochus Epiphanes in his attempt to force Hellenistic culture on the Jews of Palestine. The great Maccabean rebellion of 168 B.C. resulted, which in reality became one of the greatest epochs in Jewish history, a struggle for religious freedom in opposition to the influx of Greek ideas. At times this opposition reached the point of fanaticism, yet it awakened a new sense of national consciousness resulting in the golden days of Maccabean rulers, with such leaders as Judas, Jonathan, Simon, and John Hyrcanus, some of whom must be considered among the great men of history. For once Judaism had a state, for once its nationalistic hopes were revived; and no wonder that in these great days of territorial expansion and material prosperity under Simon and John Hyrcanus they thought of their rulers as the beginning of the Messianic dynasty and of the coming golden age, or rule of God on earth.

The period of Roman domination came next. This period, which changed the whole inner life of Judaism, started with the coming of the Roman rule under Pompey in 63 B.C. The glories of the Maccabean house were memories of the past, national freedom was a blasted hope. The domination of the Romans was so severe that the Jews were cut off from all civic and political activities of importance. They were compelled to do one of two things—to become revolutionaries or to remain passive and find a retreat in the study of the law. Thus the fact of persecution accounts for the rise of the great schools of the law, such as those of Shammai and Hillel, and for the presence of the many parties and sects which sought in different ways an escape from Roman oppression. It is right here that we find the key to an understanding of the local issues of Jesus's day. It was not a day of peace, but a period of unrest and internal discord

The various ways in which the Jews met the problem of Roman oppression is seen in the numerous parties and sects of the period. The Sadducees, a party of opportunists, made up of a priestly aristocracy, centered their activities largely in Jerusalem in connection with the temple. They rejected most of the popular

traditions and held to a strict interpretation of the law. The Pharisees were a party of laymen, sponsoring the views of common people, such as belief in angels and demons, in a coming age of tribulation, the appearance of a national deliverer, or Messiah, and the near approach of an age of triumph, or the rule of God on earth. It was within the ranks of this party that many of the violent reactions against Roman rule were centered. The Essenes, a party of protest and dissent from current practices, especially as associated with the temple, were a monastic sect living in Southern Palestine. The Zadokites were another dissenting group that migrated to Damascus and lived in communities. They appealed to the law as one of their norms of religious conduct, but went a step farther than the Sadducees and Pharisees and appealed to the prophets as well. The Zealots and the Sicarii were parties of revolutionists that believed in the use of force to drive out the hated Roman.

No historical survey of this period is complete without reference to its many important leaders. Some of the great writers will forever remain unknown, such as the authors of portions of Enoch, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Wisdom of Solomon, the As-

sumption of Moses, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra. These writers would rank well with any writers in the field of religion. Fortunately, we know a little about the author of Ecclesiasticus, Ben Sira, and we must list him with the great men of the period. The golden days of the Maccabean rule produced four notable political and military leaders, Judas, the first head of the Maccabean revolt, the diplomatic Jonathan, and then the two great leaders in the times of peace and prosperity, Simon and John Hyrcanus. Other persons worthy of note are Antipater, the father of the line of the Herods, and Herod the Great. Philo represents one of the most influential writers and thinkers coming from the Jews of the dispersion. Last but not least must be mentioned Josephus, historian and witness of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.

We turn now from the history to the study of the literature of the intertestamental period, and consider first the Palestinian writings. Most of this literature bears direct evidence of being written in Hebrew or Aramaic. This does not mean that there are no Greek influences in this literature, for in spite of the many efforts to retain racial solidarity and to control religious expressions, some of the literature

is an apologetic in the face of the rapid influx of Greek ideas into Palestine. In many cases the literature carries on the best traditions of the Old Testament, and there are many points of similarity in respect to form, content, and style; 1 Maccabees is an excellent example of a historical document, Judith is parallel to the Book of Esther, Jubilees is a parallel and an enlargement of the priestly sections, and Ecclesiasticus is similar to the Book of Proverbs, or the wisdom literature. The Psalms of Solomon are modeled on the Old Testament Psalms. The books of Enoch, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra share some of the characteristics of the apocalyptic Book of Daniel. This last group, the apocalyptic books, forms one of the most distinct and characteristic literary movements in the history of Jewish thought. The value of the apocalyptic material for the understanding of the New Testament is beyond question.

The Jewish literature of the dispersion finds its occasion in quite a different background than that of Palestine. It becomes preëminently a literature of control in seeking to create a renewed loyalty for the faith of their fathers, and at the same time to present a reasonable résumé of Jewish thought to the Greek. The

work of these Jewish writers is an attempt to make a synthesis of Jewish and Greek thought, a synthesis in which the Law is considered to be in harmony with Greek ideals or even to anticipate them. There are clear evidences of Greek influence in this literature, such as the more kindly treatment of the Gentiles and the ideas of the preëxistence of the soul and its immortality apart from a residence in an intermediate state or a resurrection. The style of this literature displays all the flexibility and elasticity of the Greek idiom, which is in such marked contrast to the books written in the Semitic languages. An interesting example of this contrast is seen in the comparison of 2 Maccabees and 3 Maccabees with 1 Maccabees, which was written in Palestine.

The fate of this great mass of Jewish literature forms one of the most interesting pages in the story of the transmission of Scripture and the formation of canons. Produced by Judaism, it lost favor with its own people and would never have come down to us if its preservation had depended upon the Jews themselves. It was taken up, however, by the Christians, and by them adapted and interpreted to fit the new faith. Not all this literature enjoyed equal favor in all sections of the Christian Church. Some of it was held in

high esteem in the Syrian, or Eastern Church, some in the North African centers, and some in the Western Church. Certain sections of the literature were recognized as canonical and included in the lists of the books of the Old Testament canon. Whether recognized in the official lists or not, the literature as a whole continued to hold the popular mind of the Church. The first step in the abandonment of much of the literature was made in the days of Jerome, when it became a working principle to recognize only the books found in the Hebrew canon as belonging to the Old Testament. The ultimate result of this policy was to throw most of this literature into discard and oblivion. A few books still lived on as the books of the Old Testament Apocrypha proper, while the apocalyptic literature in particular disappeared. The next step in the fate of this literature came in the Reformation period, when most of the books of the Old Testament Apocrypha were declared canonical by the Roman Church at the Council of Trent in 1549. This last step led to the practical abandonment of all the intertestamental literature in the case of most Protestant Churches, by whom it has been branded as false and worthless. However, in the last two centuries in particular there has been a marked renewal of

interest in this literature, and the recovery of the manuscripts fills one of the most romantic pages in the history of literature.

The value of this literature is a matter of grave doubt among many people. Some would admit elements of value, but assert that in every case these values were secondary to the Old and New Testament Scriptures. There are a few who would go so far as to judge it wholly worthless. The reason for this unfair evaluation is an unhistorical method of comparison. Much of this literature is, of course, of secondary value, possessing little literary merit and lacking some of the finer moral and religious standards of the Old Testament. But it is hardly fair to compare the best sections of the Old Testament with the worst sections of this literature. When the best sections of this literature, such as the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus, are compared with the best sections of the Old Testament, then we are in line for a fair judgment. Some of the books of this period would in no wise lower the standards of the Old Testament.

Our last task will be to inquire as to the significant contributions made by this period in the field of religious development. Only a few of these can be mentioned, and of them

the first is individualism in religion. The rise of individualism is first encountered in the days of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but it was some centuries before it emerged as a common possession of religious faith. Some of these points of emergence are easily discernible in the late Psalms and the intertestamental literature, especially in the non-apocalyptic sections. In these latter sections we have some of the finest expressions of individualistic faith in Jewish literature, such as the prayer of Manasses and the prayers in the Book of Tobit.

A careful study of the Old Testament shows that from an early day there were two tendencies at work, the stronger that of particularism, the less prominent that of universalism. The best example of a pronounced particularism is to be found in Ezekiel and of universalism in Jeremiah and Isaiah 40 to 55. This same contrast continues in the intertestamental literature, with the bulk of it in favor of particularism. The most pronounced bit of particularism is found in Jubilees, wherein we have foretold the total annihilation of the Gentiles. The best examples of the universalistic tendencies are in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Wisdom of Solomon, wherein the coming salvation of the Gentiles is posited. We owe much to the period be-

tween the Testaments in helping to keep alive this idea for further development in the New Testament.

Some of the moral teaching of this period, as in the book of Ecclesiasticus, is of the kind found in the wisdom literature of the Old Testament and of a decidedly utilitarian character. But there is also some of the loftiest moral teaching that Judaism shows. The highest development is reached in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (125 B.C.). Here the two great commandments of Leviticus and Deuteronomy, the love of God and the love of one's neighbor, are first combined in one precept. This occurs several times, but it is to be noted that neighbor always refers to a fellow Israelite, while in the Gospels there is no such limitation of meaning. Of notable ethical value is the doctrine of forgiveness as found in the same work. Forgiveness of one's neighbor means the restoration of the offender to his fellow man and his communion. A man must make every effort to become reconciled to his fellow man, no matter what the offense may be. The offender must be forgiven, not only once, but repeatedly. If he remains obstinate and will not repent, then all resentment and envy must be banished from the heart.

The significance of this in connection with the teachings of Jesus is apparent.

Of special importance is the doctrine of a future life. When the Old Testament looks forward it is to the future of the nation. There are only a few foregleams of an eschatology of the individual. The new nation in the golden age to come is made up of the remnants of Israel that are alive when that age is inaugurated. In the intertestamental literature a gradual synthesis is made between the eschatology of the nation and that of the individual by means of the idea of a resurrection. The righteous who have died are raised to take part in the new age. Later on the eschatology of the individual is wholly divorced from the eschatology of the nation, and the righteous enjoy a future life in paradise apart from the destinies of the nation. This is the unique and most valuable contribution of the period between the Testaments to the field of religious development.

We ask, finally, as to the teaching about the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God in the Old Testament is a theocracy, and if a Messiah appears he is a figure subordinate to God. It is an earthly kingdom with its capital at Jerusalem. The duration of the kingdom is forever. It is to be a time of great peace and

freedom from all evil. Frequently it is conceived in materialistic terms. This conception is carried over into the intertestamental period, but after the decay of the Maccabean house and under the oppression of the Romans, great changes take place. The earth is considered as too wicked to bear an eternal kingdom, so there occurs a breakdown in the eternal idea and the kingdom becomes temporary. At first no definite limit is placed on the duration of the kingdom. In 2 Enoch we have the only reference to a millenium in Jewish literature. The idea of a period of a thousand years is probably based on the suggestion of Psalm 90: 4, that a thousand years in the sight of God are but as a day. There is one other example of a definite limitation to the kingdom and that is the four-hundred-year kingdom in 4 Ezra. In this case the limit of four hundred years is probably fixed to offset the four hundred years of the Egyptian bondage in line with a suggestion taken from Psalm 90: 15.

.

VI

THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEAL OF CHRISTIAN CULTURE

BY DOREMUS ALMY HAYES

OUR God is the God of truth. It is the will of our God that all men shall be saved and then that all men shall come to the knowledge of the truth. Salvation first and then the completion of their culture in the acquisition of all knowledge and the assured possession of all truth.

Our Master said: "I am the truth." Paul said: "In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." It is the privilege of every disciple to search and to find all revealed truth in him.

The Spirit of God and the Spirit of Jesus is the Spirit of truth, and the promise of the Master was that when he came he would guide us into all the truth, the truth necessary to salvation and any and every other kind of truth; for all truth is one and the promise is that the Spirit will lead us into all the truth.

Any Church wholly given up to the guidance of the Holy Spirit will be devoted to the pursuit of truth as well as to the pursuit of holiness.

It will endeavor to be a Church of culture as well as of consecration, devoted to æsthetics as well as to ethics, in sympathy with the holiness of beauty as well as the beauty of holiness, the zealous patron of all the humanities as well as the jealous partisan of all the divinities of life.

The Holy Spirit is concerned with the whole man, and he is concerned with the whole race. He would save the body, which is his temple, from all uncleanness and all weakness consequent upon cherished sin. He would save the mind which he illuminates from all error which would lead to false philosophy or false ideals of life. He would save the spirit to continuous fellowship with God in unfailing fullness of joy. Man, in his integrity, is the object of his saving work and an integrated race is his final goal. Perfected humanity with perfect bodies and with perfect minds and in perfect communion with God will follow his guidance through the countless æons to come; and he, the Spirit of truth, will guide us into all the truth possible at each æon of our development, spiritual and intellectual truth as well.

Those who are filled with the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Jesus are filled with a desire for wisdom and for understanding in all things.

Therefore religion fosters learning. Piety proves itself in the pursuit of knowledge. Those who love darkness more than light, whether it be intellectual darkness or spiritual darkness, are not the perfect children of God. The Spirit-led Church of Christ will say: "All knowledge is my province. All that is good in music and poetry, painting and sculpture, literature and science belongs to me. All the fields of knowledge are open to my conquest under the leadership of the Spirit of God. All things are mine richly to enjoy and to use in the service of my Lord, whether the logic of Paul or the eloquence of Apollos or the impulse of Cephas, all the scientific secrets of this world, all the mysteries of this life, all the wonders to be revealed in and after death, whether things present or things to come, I take possession of them all in the name of Christ and to the glory of God and under the guidance and inspiration of his Holy Spirit.

"Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, I will think upon until I master them and make them my own. I will devote myself to them in ceaseless research until I have attained the truth concerning them with

the blessing and the aid of the Spirit of God. No one is more tenacious of old truth than I. No one is interested in new truth more than I. **I** desire to know all things. I do not desire knowledge for knowledge's sake or for mere curiosity. I do not desire knowledge for vanity's sake, that I may be puffed up over others. I do not desire knowledge in order to use it for any selfish end, but only for the good of others and for the glory of God in thinking his thoughts after him and in utilizing all truth for the further development of the race."

Any Church which is filled with the Spirit will talk and think in this fashion. Ignorance **is** not the mother of devotion, and devotion owes it no filial regard. Every Church which has tried to hide the keys of knowledge from the people has deserved and has won the contempt of the race. Every Church which espouses the cause of ignorance and defies the onward progress of education in its midst is doomed to a spindling existence and a dwindling career. No Church can survive which does not retain the respect of the intellect of its membership as well as appeal to the affection of their hearts.

On the statue of Copernicus at Cracow there is the inscription: "He dared to be wise." The Church of the present always must have

that daring or it never will be able to claim the future for its own. The future belongs to those who love the truth most sincerely and are willing to think most fearlessly, those who never are ready to hold a faith which is inconsistent with facts, those who are even more interested in the rights of reason than they are in any religious rites.

Dale, of Birmingham, once said: "The intellect has its rights as well as the conscience and the heart, and if religious truth does not meet the just demands of the intellect as well as of the moral nature, it will be regarded with languid interest, and will at last be either silently abandoned or rejected with open hostility and scorn." Benjamin Whichcote had said practically the same thing long before. He declared, "I always have found in myself that such preaching of others hath most commanded my heart which hath most illuminated my head," and that was true of him because he believed and said: "Man is not at all settled or confirmed in religion until his religion is the self-same with the reason of his mind; so that when he thinks he speaks reason, he speaks religion; or when he speaks religiously, he speaks reasonably; and his religion and reason are mingled together; they pass into one principle; they are no more two, but one;

just as the light in the air makes one illuminated sphere, so reason and religion in the subject are one principle."

These men are right. Scholarship and sanctity ought to grow from more to more together. The most successful evangelists will be men like Paul and Luther and Wesley, uniting intellectual gifts and university training with religious enthusiasm and spiritual zeal. The higher education is one preparation for the higher life. The inscription on the cross was written in letters of Greek and Latin and Hebrew, and the three tongues made the same proclamation that our Christ was king. The one language represented the culture of Greece. Another represented the power of the world empire of Rome. The third represented the sacred records and the faith of the Hebrew race. In the three realms represented there—the realms of culture, of power, and of faith—our Christ is to be the King forevermore.

The Holy Spirit has come to lead all men into all truth and the number of those who have consecrated themselves to the triple object of giving our Master the preëminence in faith and knowledge and all other things is increasing on every hand. The anointing of the Holy One is given to that end.

A Methodist bishop has said: "The talk of 'mere culture' is irreligious. Philosophy is no substitute for piety; but neither is piety a substitute for philosophy. Intellectual nakedness cannot be covered by a revival. Goodness cannot float ignorance. When a student asks for a laboratory it is not sufficient to point him to a mourner's bench. A professor of Latin is a fraud if he makes false quantities, though he make them in ever so pious a tone. A student may possess entire sanctification, but that does not entitle him to a Bachelor's degree. The diploma of a Christian college stands first of all for true and thorough and broad scholarship. Witherspoon, of Princeton, said long ago: 'Cursed be all that learning that is contrary to the cross of Christ; cursed be all that learning that is not coincident with the cross of Christ; cursed be all that learning that is not subservient to the cross of Christ.' All that is very fine and sound. But suppose we add: 'Cursed be all that learning which is unworthy of the cross of Christ.'"

That also is very fine and just as sound as anything that Witherspoon said, but why may we not go on to say: Blessed is all learning in so far as it represents any discovery of God's truth anywhere, for it most certainly is worthy of and coincident with and subservient to the

cross of Christ? That cross stands for the supreme triumph of the will of God in a human life and it is the will of God that all men shall come to the knowledge of all truth. Therefore the disciples of the cross ought to be in the vanguard of all progress along every line of intellectual attainment and endeavor.

All art and science and literature are some day to bring their tribute to our King. As the wise men from the East brought their gifts of frankincense and gold and myrrh to the cradle of the Christ, all the realms of human wisdom, East and West, some day will bring their treasures to the foot of his throne. In the meantime let us claim all that is lovely and of good report as belonging to our Master and our Lord. Painting, sculpture, inventions, books, all of these are the good gifts of God to men; and the least that men can do with them is to acknowledge him as their Source and to give honor to him in them all. They are all

Workings of one mind, features
Of the same face, blossoms upon one tree,
Characters of the great Apocalypse,
The types and symbols of Eternity,
Of first, and last, and midst, and without end.

The old iconoclasts were wrong. Art in all of its forms ought to be cherished by the

Church and made subservient to its needs. Spurgeon was wrong when he said: "I hate to see Christian men hang up abominable popish things, as they sometimes do, because they happen to be works of art. Burn every one of such artful works, whether prints or paintings. I would take the hammer and administer it with iconoclastic zeal on all images and pictures of saints and virgins and the like, which do but tempt men to idolatry."

Would Spurgeon have destroyed the supreme work of Christian art, the Sistine Madonna? It is an image of the Virgin, and it has a room all to itself in the gallery at Dresden. Day after day as we sat there we noticed that the crowds of tourists who were trailing through the galleries came talking and laughing and thoughtless and careless to the door of that little room and then as they crossed the threshold instantly and involuntarily became quiet and spoke in whispers or not at all, while many sat in silent awe or tarried there to pray. It was a tribute which all classes of people seemed perforce to pay to that representation of pure and perfect womanhood.

Surely the atmosphere of reverence and of devotion which pervaded that room and was felt by the most indifferent passer-by was as wholesome and as helpful as were many ser-

mons by Spurgeon. The painting hangs there day after day and year after year and century after century, silently preaching to generation after generation of men. There is room for both preaching and painting in the Church of Christ. If they are equally religious in spirit they deserve to have equally honorable recognition.

It is the mission of the Christian Church to take possession of all the legitimate realms of human endeavor and attainment and to see to it that they are permeated with the spirit of reverent devotion. The Holy Spirit always will honor most highly the Church which aims to be as good as it can and to know as much as it can, to grow in grace all the time, and at the same time to attain to more and more of the truth.

A hymn was written for the use of the Kingswood School which declared that the purpose of all higher education in that institution was to

Unite the two so long disjointed,
Knowledge and vital piety.

The announcement relative to Cokesbury College made practically the same statement. It ran; "We trust that our college will in time

send forth men who will be a blessing to their country in every laudable office and employment of life, thereby uniting the greatest ornaments of intelligent beings which are too often separated, deep learning and genuine religion." These are the ideals of the Christian Church. They ought to be the ideals of every Christian man.

We are told that Adam Clarke had every kind of diploma which represented the learning and the scholarship of his day. If he had so chosen he had the right to add twenty-two letters after his name to represent his unsought but well-merited titles. He took for one of his mottoes: "Seeketh and intermeddleth with all wisdom." We are not surprised to read that "it was an axiom with him, that 'speculative truth can never be alien to practical wisdom.' He held that all knowledge is valuable, and that a minister of the gospel may find a use for every species of information. Thus, when a young preacher once asked him whether he would advise him to study mineralogy, he promptly replied: 'By all means; a Methodist preacher should know everything. Partial knowledge on any branch of science or business is better than total ignorance. To have a variety of subjects of study will, instead of exhausting the mind, minister to its invigora-

tion; for, when wearied with one, the surest means of refreshment is to have recourse to another.' The old adage of 'Too many irons to the fire,' said he, 'contains an abominable lie. You cannot have too many—poker, tongs, and all, keep them all going!'"

There is the ideal for every Christian. We ought to be more knowing and more holy. We ought to know everything. We ought at least to desire to know everything and to do our best to know everything. We ought to be holy. At the very least any Christian man will strive to attain perfect wholeness of body, mind, and spirit in the sight of God. All wisdom is divine. When Paul enumerates the gifts of the Spirit he names the word of wisdom and the word of knowledge before faith and healing and miracles. The man led by the Spirit will be led into truth, and he will value the truth more than any mere wonders. All truth is of God, and it is the eternal ideal of the Christian Church to possess itself of all that is approved as truth in every realm of knowledge, believing that as it comes to know the ways of God and the works of God it may come into closer fellowship with him and his blessing will rest the more abundantly upon it. Only complete Christian culture will meet the ideal of the Christian Church.

VII

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE EARLY CHURCH

BY HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL

SOME time ago there came to the theological school which I represent a professor from a Jewish theological seminary. In a series of lectures this scholar set forth for us the meaning of Judaism. A little later it was my privilege to return the visit and to tell the young men preparing in the Hebrew Union College for their work as rabbis what the meaning of Christianity was. No easy task! They might well have turned to me and said: "Christianity? Which of the fifty-seven varieties are you bringing to us?" But I did not want to present a variety. I did not come to represent Methodism or Presbyterianism, Protestantism or Roman Catholicism, but Christianity as it had moved through the centuries and as it lives in our world to-day.

I believe that there is such a unity of Christianity and that it is important for us to find it to-day. It is no mere academic matter. Everywhere Christian men are asking how the divided Christian fellowship can become one

again. Every mission field, every great city, every village of our land shows us how important this question is. We are dividing our forces in the face of the greatest evils that the world has ever seen. We are doing more; we are depleting our life. We may be as proud as we will of our own separate group, but no one part of the body can be as rich in the life of God and the spirit of its Master as the united body would be. The great conference on Christian Faith and Order, held in Lausanne in 1927, where every branch of the Christian Church was represented except the Roman Catholic, is a sign of this deepening interest. Equally important was the conference held at Stockholm the year before.

These two conferences showed how deep the desire for Christian unity was; but they showed also how difficult it was to attain. More and more it becomes clear that Christian unity will demand two things. The first of these is the Christian spirit. It is an easy mistake to make to suppose that we can have Christian unity by agreeing upon a common creed, or accepting sacraments, or a form of Church organization. Christian unity is a matter of spirit and life, of love and faith and good will. A denomination, a single congregation even, with common creed and organiza-

tion, may yet lack Christian unity. In this the true and large sense, Christian unity will come only as the kingdom of God comes upon earth. And when it comes it will include family and community, races and nations, as well as the Christian Church.

But one other thing is needed, and that is understanding, a truer apprehension of what Christianity really is. Lausanne showed how men could be sincere followers of Jesus, earnestly desirous of coming together, and yet not find the way because they differed so fundamentally in their conception of Christianity. It is this second point with which we are dealing in the present discussion. Our plan is to turn to the early Church, to see what it was that held it together despite the differences that were there. That may help us better to understand what Christianity really is and so to move a little farther toward the end of Christian unity.

Let us recognize at the beginning that in the conflict of our many Christian groups and divisions, this has been a favorite plan, to go back again and again to the early Church, to Jesus, or to the early Christian community. Here is Christianity, each group has said, and we are the true followers. In most cases there has been a double error in this procedure.

In the first place, it has been assumed that Christianity at the beginning was something tangible, definite, something clearly formulated. Christianity was conceived as an institution. As to what the institution was, men differed. For many it was a sum of teaching expressed for all time in the Scriptures or in certain creeds. Others laid more stress upon the organization; Christianity was the Church, with its priestly organization, its sacraments which it controlled and through which men obtained salvation, its authority to direct conduct, and its power to define doctrine.

From this followed the other error, the idea that Christianity was something complete and finished at the beginning, unchangeable except as it might become perverted, and that therefore the only place to go in order to find out the real nature of Christianity was to the day of its beginnings. To some extent, those who laid stress upon the institution of the Church as the essence of Christianity left room for development, but even there the institution of the Church in every essential aspect was complete from the beginning.

The most obvious comment upon all this is that this is not at all what we find when we study historically the beginnings of Christianity. Where is there definition of the

Church, or prescription as to its organization, or even uniformity of practice in this field, not to speak of delegation of authority and provision for handing it on? Where are the definitions as to sacraments and the directions as to their mode of celebration? Casual references there are, of course, but compare these with the careful definition in theory and the meticulous direction as to practice which the Roman Catholic Church, for example, considers necessary. And where are the statements defining incarnation and Trinity and atonement? The concern of Jesus, as of the early Church, lies clearly in another field, in the sphere of spirit and life. Christianity began as a great living movement that found but slowly the thought forms and the ecclesiastical forms in which to express its life.

And that suggests the necessary comment on the second point. If this early Christianity must be studied as first of all spirit and life, then there will be movement, progress, growth, for that is what marks life wherever found. If we go back to the study of early Christianity, it will not be with the idea that here alone true Christianity is to be found, or that by this alone it is to be understood. You cannot understand a great movement of life without going to its sources, and in this case the source

has remained its abiding inspiration and guide. But neither can you understand it without following the movement down through the sweep of its history, so that the meaning of the beginning may be understood in the outworking of the end.

Religion was old in the earth when Christianity came. The first followers of Jesus belonged to a people who had a great and noble faith. They believed in one God, Maker of all things, God of all men, righteous and merciful, and calling men to serve him in mercy and righteousness. The first Christians dropped most of the forms of Judaism, gradually or suddenly, but they kept this great faith. If now we ask what they had that was new, it might be answered in two words, Jesus and the Spirit. We must look at these two words more closely.

And, first of all and most of all, at the meaning of Jesus. One might almost define Christianity by the one word, Christ, yet we must point out more specifically what he meant to them. We may do that best, perhaps, by taking one of the simple but profound words of the Fourth Gospel: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life."

Jesus was to those disciples the truth. Re-

ligion is, first of all, a conviction; it is an assurance of some higher Being that has reached our life, it is a faith in God. It was no mere emotion that stirred these early Christians, and no passing dream of a new world that was to be; they believed that God had spoken to them, that he had made himself known in a great redeeming deed. They found in Jesus the revelation of God; he was God's Word to men, as John said. They saw "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" in his face. They dared to believe that the spirit of mercy and righteousness which they saw in Jesus was the Spirit of the eternal God himself. They believed in the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ.

They believed in Jesus as the way. "The men of the way" the early Christians were called. They saw in Jesus not only what God was, but what man was to be. Not in terms of abstract theory, of speculation as to substance and essence, but in this rich and vital way they found him at once human and divine. They were conscious that he had not only pointed the way, but started them upon it. There was a new spirit of good will in their midst that bound them together. So great a leader as Paul was constantly concerned with pointing out what this spirit of Jesus meant as a way of

living. Flatly he declared that no man was Christian who did not share this spirit, just as his Master had insisted that the sharing of the Father's spirit of good will was the final test for those who would be children of that Father. So there came to be more and more clearly discerned the goal of the Christian hope: for the individual, that he might grow up in this spirit in him who was the head; for the world, that it might see a new humanity, a fellowship whose life was all ruled by this spirit.

But beyond all this Jesus was for them the life, not simply as example, but as gift. Christianity has always been a religion of salvation. It has not simply been a belief about God or a way of living demanded by God; it has been the faith in a God who gave life to men. The first form which this hope took with the early Christians was that of a new world, a kingdom of God that was to be ushered in very soon, as they believed, when Jesus returned to earth. From the first, however, salvation meant something more to them than this hope of a new world in the future. It meant a new life that had already begun. The good news was not simply of a better world that was to be. There was a good news of forgiveness and fellowship, of the God of mercy who had come to

them in Christ, of the meaning of the death of Christ as God's word of reconciliation spoken to men.

The second great word that expresses what was new in Christianity and what made this early Christianity, is the Spirit. It is not easy to tell in a few words what this meant. The New Testament uses different terms: Spirit of God, Holy Spirit, Spirit of Christ, God in you, Christ in you. There is no definition here, no attempt to formulate a doctrine, but there is a rich and wonderful life and a strong faith whose meaning becomes more and more clear as we study it. It may be put in three phrases: Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ, spirit of man.

Of course, the early Church did not begin with such distinctions or definitions. The beginning was a great experience. That first group of disciples felt that God had come to them in Jesus. They had heard his word as the word of God. He had died, but they had seen him and knew that he lived. They believed that he would come again. But it did not stop there, as we have seen. They had a religion of the present. There had been given to them not only a vision of God, but a presence of God, not only the promise of a life, but the possession of a life. When we look at

this experience we shall see that it is described by the three phrases above.

This new life was for them an experience of the presence of God. This spirit of love and peace, this faith, this joy, this new courage, this was not something of their own doing or achieving. This was God's gift, this was God in them. Here was a new vision of God, not far off, but dwelling among his people and in his people as the power of a new life. They could understand Paul's word: "Work out your own salvation, because it is God that worketh in you." They would have understood Augustine: "Give what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt." It was a great conviction, one which they apprehended but in part and which the Church of the passing years has been slow to grasp: faith in an immanent God, the life of all his world, the fellow of man in toil and pain, the Spirit of love and truth and righteousness wherever these are found in the world.

But this Spirit was Spirit of Christ as well as Spirit of God; "Christ in us," they said. It was not some vague and mysterious essence, nor some strange power; it was a Christlike Spirit. They knew the spirit that had been in Jesus, his spirit of mercy and purity, of utter good will and single loyalty, of humble

devotion and of divine power; and the power of his life they knew was the power of God's Spirit in him. The God who was in Christ and like Christ was their only God; and it was his Spirit, the Christ Spirit, which was now given to them and which made their new life. Once for all it was settled for Christianity that the Spirit of God in man meant not primarily rapturous emotion or miraculous powers, but Christlikeness of life. "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

And one thing more: This Spirit of God is also spirit of man. The new life is man's life. It was not sheer power that overwhelmed them, it was not something foreign to human nature that came in. It was man's true life, man's real life, helping him for the first time to be his real self. This faith, this love, this courage and joy, this was their own life, a free life lived by men who were "new creatures." The religion was through and through ethical.

Here, then, is what is distinctive and constitutive for early Christianity: a faith and loyalty that center in Jesus, that take from him inspiration and strength and content; an experience that is also connected with Jesus, but whose meaning is best suggested by the word Spirit,

Now we must turn to another side of the whole matter. What of creed and ritual? What of organization and clergy and sacred writings? Certain facts may be set down in order about these.

1. Early Christianity had its forms and institutions, and they were important for it. The spirit must shape a body in order to live and become effective in this world. The faith took shape in creed. The worship found for itself a ritual. The fellowship became an organization, with its prophets and evangelists, its servants and elders and overseers. Out of the teachings came the writings, and the most significant of these became the possession at last of the whole Church.

2. Yet the unity of the early fellowship was not in these institutions or forms, but in the spirit and the life. In these matters there was large freedom. Paul differed from Peter and the other Jerusalem leaders as to the meaning of the old ways for the new faith. There was no one common Church government; the Pauline Churches did not look to Jerusalem for direction and the Jerusalem Churches did not turn to Paul. They sought to keep the unity of the Spirit, and they believed that the living Spirit of God gave them guidance. There were changes with time in the ideas expressed.

The ardent hope of the early and visible return of Jesus almost disappears from the Fourth Gospel, and in its place we have the teaching of an abiding presence of the Christ of the Spirit. There is freedom and growth here, nothing rigid and final in relation to these forms of life and doctrine.

3. With the passing years, the institutional side developed more and more. Out of debates issued the creeds. Out of missionaries and evangelists and servants (deacons) and overseers (bishops), there came priests and bishops and archbishops and cardinals and pope. Out of simple worship came an elaborate sacramentarian system through which alone men thought salvation could be obtained. The Bible became a system of revealed doctrines and an inerrant book. What is more significant, men came to think that in these forms the essential Christian religion was found, no longer in the spirit and the life. The forms which were here to serve life took the position of master; the instruments became the end.

4. It is in connection with these forms, or institutions, that there appear the divisions that separate the parts of the Christian Church. One group emphasizes a set of doctrines, another a form of organization, still another a form of sacrament or the meaning of these

sacraments, while others insist upon a literally inspired Scriptures.

5. Despite all this, Christianity has persisted as a great stream of life. It has used the imperfect forms, sometimes asserted itself despite the forms, sometimes triumphed over them. The historic Jesus, with the challenge of his life and ideals, with the inspiring and redeeming power of his spirit, has been too strong for all obstacles. The Roman Catholic, with priest and penance and mass, the Quaker without sacrament or clergy, have alike felt and shown his power. Beneath all differences men have been held by his mastery of conscience, his way of life, his revelation of God.

6. But Christianity has not simply looked back; it has moved forward. It has had the principle of progress within itself alike in the person of its Founder and in its faith in God as indwelling Spirit. From the time of its first great interpreters, Paul and John, Jesus has been not a teacher of rigid doctrine or of an unchanging code, but rather a guiding and life-giving spirit. The idea of the Holy Spirit has often been narrowed by definition, limited to ecclesiasts and Church councils and sacred writings, or misused by enthusiasts. But it has remained, despite all this, a guiding principle of freedom, and of progress in spiritual

faith and moral truth. It has kept Christianity facing forward with the faith in a living God, not simply a God of the remote past or the distant skies, but one dwelling in men and working with them and leading into new truth and larger life. The doctrine of the indwelling Spirit shows a Christianity that has room for all truth from every source. Science has helped it to a truer understanding of how God works in the world. The experience of the years has shown better how God is bringing in his kingdom. And the old ideas of sin and salvation are taking on larger meanings.

What, then, may we learn about Christian unity from the early Church and the passage of the years?

1. The unity of Christendom will not come by seeking agreement in statements of doctrine or forms of organizations. These have been the points at which men have divided, these are not the heart of religion, and these must themselves change again as they have in the past. Our unity will not be uniformity.

2. The unity will probably not be that of one great organization. It was not such in the early Church. The Pauline Churches did not look to Jerusalem as authority, nor the Jerusalem community to Paul.

3. If we go back to the early Church it must be to its spirit and faith and life, not its institutions. We must learn from it how to keep the unity of the spirit with differences in custom and conception, and we must realize how its forms and institutions have undergone constant change since that day.

4. Our immediate task is better to understand what Christianity is and where religion really lies, and better to understand and appreciate each other—Baptist and Methodist, Roman Catholic and Protestant, fundamentalist and modernist.

5. We must use every opportunity to further actual fellowship. That may mean organic union as in the noble example which Canada has set. It will mean increased coöperation in Christlike service. It will mean in a thousand towns and cities the elimination of unnecessary Churches where a lesser number will better advance God's kingdom. It will mean more fellowship in worship. Above all, it will mean a deeper devotion to God and a larger measure of the spirit of Christ.

6. If we ask what was the heart of the faith and life of the early Church, it may be put in two words, Jesus and the Spirit. Christianity is the fellowship of the followers of Jesus, taking from him its historic rise and its abiding

inspiration, finding in him its vision of God, its ideal of life, its source of saving help, and its hope for the individual and the world. Its unifying principle, therefore, is Jesus. But its unifying life is the indwelling Spirit of God, at once a faith and an experience. It is a spirit of love and faith and service, alike the goal of its endeavor and the witness of that indwelling God whose Spirit the Christian knows as the spirit of Jesus.

VIII

FAITH IN GOD IN AN AGE OF SCIENCE

BY HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL

"THE NEW UNIVERSE" is the title which Professor Brownell, of Northwestern University, has given to a recent volume in which he has tried to bring together the new knowledge about the world which has come in the last generation. The title is justified. We live almost literally in a new world, for a man's real world is that which he knows, with which he has some sort of relation; and the new knowledge has given us a new world.

It is a world inconceivably greater than that which our fathers knew. They lived in a world which man's thought could easily handle. History was but a little span that stretched only four thousand years beyond Christ. The earth was the center of the universe. Around it circled sun and moon and stars, made for man's convenience and delight. All that has changed. The history of man takes us back scores of thousands of years, perhaps a hundred thousand or five hundred thousand; and this globe is older than that by ages. The earth itself is only a tiny fragment of this universe. The sun

about which it moves is a million times larger, and that sun is one of the least among a thousand million suns that form our galactic system. So vast is this universe that we cannot measure it by miles. Swifter than any other movement we know is the passage of light, 186,000 miles in a second, eleven million miles in a minute. Yet there are stars so distant that the light which started from them before the pyramids were built has not yet arrived at our earth, and beyond our galactic system are other systems of like size. The nearest is so far that a million years is hardly time enough for the swift-speeding light to travel to our globe.

Not only has science pushed back the walls of space and time, it has shown us that there is a world of the unbelievably small. It has written the story of the microbe, the story of a world of life hidden from sight, bearer of disease and plague, yet without which the human race could not exist. And to this it has added the even more wonderful story of the atom, no longer some last, lifeless particle of matter, as the older science taught, but itself a universe, with its electrons moving in their regular orbits and its being throbbing with energy.

All this, however, is only, as it were, the

framework of the new world. Even more important is the new way of looking at the universe and conceiving its ongoing life. Three words suggest this new conception. The first is development, or evolution. The universe is not something fixed, unchanging. With distant suns, with life on earth, with the very chemical elements of which this earth is made, we have the same story, the story of ceaseless change. What is has come out of the past and will in turn give way to something else. Individuals, nations, planets, suns—all have their course of birth and growth and decay. The second idea is that of order, order everywhere, nowhere chance; the task of science is to discover this order, the way in which things behave, or what we call the laws of nature. Dynamic is the third word. The old world of dead and lifeless matter is gone; reality is energy, power, the power to do.

Such is the world that science brings us today. What does it mean for religion, for the Christian religion in particular, and for our faith in God? There are many who have felt that the new science and the old religion could not go together. Some of these held to religion and fought vigorously what they considered the false and impious theories of science.

Some of them held to science, and gave up, readily or reluctantly, the religious faith. To both it seemed that when you asserted evolution, with its endless ages of development, you had ruled out the Bible with its Genesis account of creation, and so the Christian belief in a Creator God.

The God of gracious care, of seedtime and harvest, of listening ear and answering prayer, was replaced by a lifeless mechanism, whose unchanging order moved through all things without purpose or pity or hate. And to all this was added the word of those who, having banished God and goodness and purpose from the world, ruled out at last the soul of man himself, leaving a mere automaton, deluded with the thought that he was rational and free, but in the end no more than a series of reactions following inevitably and mechanically from the stimuli supplied by his world.

Now, let it be said at once that such conclusions have never followed necessarily from any assured results of science. They have sprung on the one hand from individual thinkers whose conclusions outran their knowledge, and on the other hand from men of religion who could not distinguish between an abiding faith and its changing forms of expression. Beyond that, however, there are certain

lines of definite progress which we have been making which help to clear up some of the issues in this debate about science and religion.

We are making advance as regards science and its meaning. First of all, we are getting past the stage of science-olatry. There are still people, theologians some of them, who take off their hats and make the sign of reverence when the word science is spoken. And there are a few scientists, it may be, who think that an exact knowledge of a fraction of the world of things gives them the right to speak the final word upon other subjects. Your true scientist knows, of course, how small the fragment of his knowledge is and that his most significant conclusions are hypotheses in which he tries to understand the meaning of the multitude of facts that he has gathered. He knows, too, how his knowledge is ever being enlarged and his hypotheses changed, of how little value the textbooks of yesterday are for the physics and chemistry and biology of to-day.

What is more important still, we are coming to see better the scope and limits of science. It is natural science with which we are dealing here, and about this we note two facts. First, it has to do only with the world of things, with

things as they appear in space and time, with what can be observed by our senses and measured by our instruments. In its own world it has been wonderfully successful, but we must remember that it leaves another world to one side, and that this world is the one that counts most for men. Here is the world of beauty. You cannot measure beauty, nor weigh it. You may speak of its value, but that is not a term of science. Physics may describe the nature of light, the laws of refraction, the interfering elements in the atmosphere as illustrated at sunset; but the beauty of a sunset and its glory lie wholly beyond its ken. So chemistry may tell you the salt and iron and sulphur and the rest which go to make up a man; but what this added something is that we call life it cannot tell, and still less what this man is in terms of reason and character, of friendship and loyalty, what he is as a personal being, as a *man*. Yet it is just this in which we are most interested. The world with which, after all, we are most concerned is the world of persons and values, of man and God, of love and truth and beauty and goodness and justice. There is no fault here with which science is to be chided; it is doing its proper work. But those are to be

corrected who think that the world with which science deals is the only world.

The second fact is this, that even as regards this world of nature, science leaves important questions to one side. Let me put it as a great English scientist, Sir E. Ray Lankester, once stated it: "No sane man has ever pretended, since science became a definite body of doctrine, that we know, or ever can hope to know, whence the mechanism has come, why it is there, whither it is going, and what may or may not be beyond it or beside it, which our senses are incapable of appreciating. These things are not 'explained' by science and never can be." Science tells how things behave in this universe of ours. It seeks to discover the order that is here and to describe it, and this description it calls laws. But the human mind can never rest satisfied with this. Whence did this world come? What does life mean, and what is it worth? Is there a purpose in it all? Is there wisdom and goodness in the power that is moving through it all? These are the questions which religion seeks to answer, and nothing in science stands in the way of that task.

But if we have come to understand science better, so also have we come to a better ap-

preciation of religion; and that has helped us to solve our problem of the relation of religion and science. Religion is a conviction, an attitude, and a life. It is a conviction that there is a world of higher reality beside this world that we see, a world of the spirit, of God; and it is in relation to that world, religion believes, that the true life of man is found. Religion is an attitude toward this world and toward life, an attitude of reverence, of trust, and of loyalty. And religion is a life, a life that expresses this conviction and attitude and that is lived out in relation to God and the world and man. Religion, as we have seen, must express itself in forms, in Church and creeds and sacred writings and the rest, but these are not religion itself. And we are learning to make that distinction.

And the conclusion from all this is significant. Christianity is not tied up with the letter of the Bible nor with a particular formulation of doctrine. We have learned to know the Bible as a book of life coming from religious experience and seeking to express the meaning of that experience in the thought terms of its own day. It is not a book of science nor of theology. Genesis holds up before us the great idea of a creating God, from whom all things come; but if we wish to know how this God actually

works, we turn, not to Genesis, but to the world about us which God has made and in which he is still working. Despite the picture forms of the universe that come to us through the men of the Bible, there is no reason why we should put the earth at the center of the universe or why we should not believe that life on earth and the earth itself and the stars in their courses have come by gradual development.

Evolution itself, once the *bête noire* of simple faith, has come for thoughtful men to be one of the chief reasons why we must look beyond science and the world of science. To many it seemed at first a blind, mechanical process, that neither pointed back to a creative Power nor looked forward to any purpose. But closer thought brings both of these elements back again, even if in new form. We are beginning to see more clearly that evolution involves not simply continuity, but change; not simply the connection with the old, but the appearance of the new. And the new is really new, it is different. And the new is higher; you cannot reduce the mental life to the lower subconscious life, nor life itself to the mere atom. It is not something merely mechanical. With a machine nothing really

new and different appears, no matter how long you shuffle and how much you shift the parts. You cannot have evolution, real evolution, without a creative element. Evolution, like the rest of science, leaves the great questions unanswered, and, indeed, points beyond itself.

And there is something purposive here too. The movement in evolution is not blind and meaningless, like drifting leaves swirled this way and that to no end. Whatever of loss and waste there may seem to be, however costly the process (and Christianity has place for the idea of sacrifice and pain, provided there be meaning to it), and however many blind alleys there may have been along the road, yet the road is there and is unmistakable. It is a road that leads from lower to higher, it involves a physical setting of complex adjustment without which the process and progress would not be possible, and it reaches for us its highest stage in man where a new kind of evolution appears, an evolution in which the creature man ceases to be mere subject and becomes the shaping master of his own world, guiding it consciously to higher goals.

Of course this sort of purposiveness is different from that of the carpenter argument which appealed to our fathers, where each object in nature pointed to a maker and a

purpose, like Paley's watch found on the beach. It is not piecemeal contrivance that we have here. It is a purposiveness, a movement toward an end, that pervades the whole stream of life. But the purposiveness is here, and it goes still farther back, as has been pointed out by a Harvard professor of biological chemistry, L. J. Henderson, in two works on *The Order of Nature* and *The Fitness of the Environment*. He shows how the physical constitution and conditions of our earth are adapted to life and make it possible. With other substances, heat expands and cold contracts. But let water contract when freezing instead of expanding; let the proportions of carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen change; reduce the great quantities of carbonic acid or of water in the earth; in fact, alter the situation in the physical world at any one of a score of points, and the appearance and maintenance of life, so far as we can see, would have been wholly impossible.

All this, of course, does not "prove" the idea of God, but it certainly points away from the conception of the world as explained in terms of matter. It justifies the word of Professor A. N. Whitehead, of Harvard, who comments upon the blindness of religious thinkers in opposing evolution and declares that "a

thoroughgoing evolutionary philosophy is inconsistent with materialism." And it looks away from every theory of the world as merely mechanical. A machine will permit rearrangement of parts, but can never produce what is higher. Evolution presents the picture of being moving on to continually higher planes. A machine moves backward or forward as you will; evolution is always movement in one way, there is no retracing. With a machine you can absolutely predict. But no knowledge of the atom could have predicted a living organism, nor all the facts about the protozoa point the inevitable way to the vertebrates or plot the line leading to man. True, it has been claimed that if we only knew all the facts, we could start with the primal fire mist and forecaste the plays of Shakespeare or the character of Jesus. But that, of course, is not science, but dogma, and a dogma which the facts as we come to know them discredit more and more.

The tendency of modern thought at this point is easily seen by reference to books from scientists and from philosophers who seek to use the results of science. We note earlier works like Bergson's *Creative Evolution* and *The Realm of Ends*, by James Ward. Even more significant are scientific writings of recent years like *Emergent Evolution*, by Lloyd Morgan,

and *The Grand Strategy of Evolution*, by William Patten, with the works of men like J. Arthur Thomson and J. Y. Simpson; while from the more philosophic side we have such treatises as *Cosmic Evolution*, by J. E. Boodin, and *Holism and Evolution*, by J. C. Smuts. To these may be added the works of Professor Henderson, to which reference has already been made.

One other consideration is in order here. It has to do not with the conclusions of science, but with its presuppositions. Science assumes that the universe is one and that it is pervaded by order throughout. All parts of it are related in some way and, given the same conditions, we may count upon things behaving in the distant nebula of Andromeda just as they do here, or as having behaved in the remote past as they do in the present. Without this, science could not even begin its work. But where did science get this fundamental conviction? From observation or proof? Impossible, for its studies compass only a minute fragment of the universe and but a few moments out of the reaches of time. Back of this idea is the unproved conviction, implied in such words as cosmos and universe and natural law, that there is one power that moves in this universe and that this power is grounded in reason.

We deal here with a matter of faith that came ultimately from religion. So far from banishing reason from the world-ground and leaving a machine, science implies a world of reason, a reason so profound and so thoroughgoing that it demands the severe labors of the acutest of minds to apprehend it. If we may trust what is said in connection with Einstein and his theory, there are aspects of the universe which only minds of the very highest order can grasp.

Let us sum up our conclusions. Natural science does not and cannot exclude God, because it deals only with the world that appears in space and time, and even with this world does not raise the final questions. It cannot prove the existence of God, but it does point beyond the world of things and a mere mechanical order. It demands a world of unity and order—that is, a world that can only be understood by reason and that thus implies reason. As portrayed by evolution it suggests not only a cause that works in continuous creation and in purposive fashion, but a ground or source which can rationally account for the ever higher levels of being that appear, and that must have within itself what is at least as high as that to which it has given rise.

But the most important question for us is this: Has the new knowledge which has come to us helped us in any way to a truer or larger vision of God? To that we may reply emphatically, yes. To answer that question as it should be, we ought to include not merely natural science, but historical study, psychology, and the great social and political movement of human life. In the history of faith it has happened again and again that religion confronted a crisis which seemed to destroy its very foundations, only in turn to rise to a purer faith and a larger life. The prophets faced that when Israel went into captivity and met the taunting cry: Where is now thy God? But out of that crisis came a purer conception of Jehovah as God of righteousness and God of the nations. The early Church heard a like query, when the years passed and their Master did not return as they had expected, and men said: "Where is the promise of his coming?" Yet out of this came a truer understanding of the kingdom of God and the way of God's working in the world. If ours be a God of nature, then science, which studies nature, should help us to know him. And if God be a living God, moving in the world's life, then history should show us more clearly how he works on earth.

To begin with, it is worth something to have our religious thinking purged of crudities and errors. The men of the Bible who wrote about God and nature used the thought forms of the science of their day in expressing their faith. A later day identified the form with the faith and so insisted that this primitive science was inspired and infallible. We no longer think of the earth as the center of the universe. We face the possibility that our tiny earth may not be the only habitation of creatures who have reached the height of rational and moral life that makes possible fellowship with God. We see no reason why we should not hold that life on earth, yes, the earth itself and all the stars of heaven, came to be by gradual development. We know that religion, too, is under this law of growth, and that religions must grow or die. It does not disturb us to see

Knowledge grow from more to more.

It may mean perplexity and pain as old ideas are discarded, but there is no reason why with this there should not

More of reverence in us dwell.

If we are to "grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth," it will presumably involve our discarding some old ideas in religion and gaining some new and larger insights.

Our study of science and history and psychology has helped us to a truer appreciation of how God works in his world. The point of greatest importance is the realization of the closer relation of God to his world. The old static world is gone. With such a world it was easy to think that God could make it in a moment of time, watch over it from a distance, and move in it occasionally at will in miracle or providence or answer to prayer. We cannot think that way now. If God be creator, then he must be eternally creating, for the world is eternally becoming new and different. If God be in any part of his world, in the heart of a saint, in the vision of a seer, in the deliverance of a nation, in the death of Jesus, then he must be in all the world and in all its life. For this is no piecemeal world; it is one, and one order moves through it all. Here it is *aut omne aut nihil*. It is God in all things or in none. This new world of our modern thought, in which the real is energy and action, in which all things come under one great order, in which ceaseless change and growth are the mark of being, this world is not a machine which rules out God; but if there be a God then he must be a living, present God who moves through it all.

The great Christian affirmations remain.

Neither natural science nor history nor psychology can give them or take them away. They are the great convictions of the human heart, the answer of men to that which they have seen in Jesus Christ. What are these affirmations? In substance, these two. God is good and has a purpose for men; God is great and on him all things depend. In a word, we believe that goodness and power are one. The Power that moves through all and sustains all in the ceaseless working of the ages and the infinite stretches of the stars is good with the goodness that we have seen in Jesus. And goodness is power, greater than the world, more than the world. However closely God is joined to his world, yet always there is a goodness that is more than what we see. It is at once the goal of the ages and the power that will work out this end. And the world that is and the better world that waits to be, both are utterly dependent upon this God.

In these great affirmations we stand with our fathers, but in the thought of how this God works his ends and how he rules his world, we are children of the newer light. We see him as the God eternally creating, the God who is ever saying: "Behold, I make all things new." We see him as infinite power, not above his world, uttering some fiat of authority and let-

ting his will be done by a word, but in his world as the energy that works in it all, so that we and all things live and move and have in him our being, whether it be the orbit of the electron, the sweep of countless suns, or the life of man's spirit.

We have come, too, to see deeper spiritual meanings in the order of nature. It is not for us a soulless mechanism, or a blind and inexorable inevitability. It is the divine way of working, a way that has a far deeper wisdom than any primitive faith in casual intervention. The laws of nature are the thoughts of God. Order in nature is the inevitable quality that must belong to a world whose maker is at once faithful and wise. The casual and haphazard belong to our bungling ways and not to the sure wisdom of God. The uncertain and changing are the mark of our imperfect character as against the unchanging faithfulness of God. Once men put nature over against God and saw God in the strange event that broke in upon the common order; the supernatural was the unnatural. Now God is for us the real meaning of nature; the inner meaning of all natural is supernatural. But the order of the world does not make a prison for God. The laws of nature are the instruments of God; they represent the kind of a world which makes

possible the achieving of God's great ends. And the simplest illustration of this is to consider what this order of nature means for man. For him it is not a prison wall, but an open door; not a barrier, but a tool. Because this is a world of sure order, man can understand it, can depend upon it, and so make its forces the ministers of his needs. And shall the world of law be the servant of finite man and not of the Lord of all who made it?

At one other point the new knowledge has helped us to see larger meanings in the Christian idea of God. Religion has been wont to say, God is good and God is power, but it has not brought these two into unity as it should. The power of God and his authority too much dominated the picture; his love and mercy seemed like just one more easy exercise of that power which made the world. True, Christianity thought of Jesus as the supreme revelation of God and the cross as the center of that light in which God has shined into our world. But the cross too often seemed like an episode, like some abnormal intervention, some violent expedient made necessary by an abnormal because sinful world. We talked about God's love and sacrifice in sending his Son, but somehow the suffering and sacrifice seemed to be

not so much in God as in the person of Jesus, and even for him men thought of it as a terrible but passing moment that interrupted an eternity of security and joy.

The new knowledge has bid us turn from such speculations and face the world as it is, with the story of nature and man that it has revealed. We have had to give up the idea of a world that came at a moment in full perfection. We thought of God in terms of sheer power, that by a word could bring what it would to pass. We are less inclined to be dogmatic now as to what God can or cannot do. We have come to the humbler place where we ask what God really does, and we look to the story of God's world for the answer. There we see that the actual method of God is that of growth, with toil and conflict and pain. Whether it be this globe of man's inhabiting, or the sturdy oak, or the character of a saint, or God's kingdom on earth, not one appears at a mere word of command, each comes by the same slow way. The long road and the great cost, that is plain to all; what is not so plain to some is what this means in terms of our thought of God. But ought it not to be plain to us by now? Bring together the new knowledge and our faith in Christ. Gone is the God who works from aloft by some easy word of power.

In his place is the vision of a God who dwells with men and walks their path of labor and pain. The power is still here, but it is a new kind of power, the power of life and love, of infinite patience and endless toil, of truth, and of sacrifice. There is a new and deeper wisdom here, the wisdom that sees that some goals can come only by these means. The cross is here, but it is not a mere episode in history, not a momentary entrance of God upon human life; it is rather the most perfect expression of the love of the self-giving God which has always been at work in the life of the world. And the wonder of that love grows upon us. There is a freedom which God gives to his world, to nature in a measure, to man most of all. But the freedom is not isolation; life moves on its way, but God is in it all. The toil of man is his toil and in their suffering he suffers. He is comrade of man sharing his life and pain, and he is the life itself by which man is borne along. "In his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old."

IX

MESSIAHS NEW AND OLD

BY HARRIS FRANKLIN RALL

It was at the Hobo College, one of Chicago's interesting institutions. Hoboes, of course, are not tramps, but migratory workers. Laid off in winter, they gather in the big city. The Hobo College holds its sessions during the winter three times a day, with lectures and addresses followed by discussion. I was speaking on religion and what it offers to men. My half hour was followed by an hour of question and comment. There were plenty of men there who had their theories as to how to make a wrong world right, and at the close one of my auditors gave me his answer in a three-hundred-page book that he had written, entitled *The Universal Panacea*.

Not all men are so sure that they have a complete answer to all the world's problems, but great numbers have their messiah and many more there are who are looking for one. They are forever scanning new claimants and asking hopefully: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" For it takes no preacher to point out to men the evil of this

world, and men were never more vividly certain of it than they are to-day. But man is certain of one thing more. In his heart he feels sure that there is a way out, that there is a better world that is waiting for us. And so men are asking: "What is the answer to our need? Who will lead us into the promised land?"

The story of these hopes that men have had is a splendid story. It is the story of dreams that have called out toil beyond measure and courage and devotion that cannot be described. But it has its tragic chapters where false leaders have been followed and whole nations have suffered. We remember that it was the followers of John the Baptist who asked, nineteen hundred years ago: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" And we remember that in the end their nation chose a leader who led them to armed revolt against Rome, and the star of their hope went down in darkness and blood. To-day, as then, many voices are calling. From a score of camps come the summons to join one standard or another. The disappointments of the centuries have not crushed out all hope. The very desperateness of humanity's needs to-day has made us the more eager. But the warning history and the tragic need should both make us more careful

as we consider the messiahs which are offered to us. We can turn to a few only of the many that are bidding for the suffrage of men to-day.

Let us put at the forefront one of the most formidable of claimants in our day, science. Some would write it with a capital, for it has become the god of their hopes. And the argument which these men make has great persuasiveness. The men of the past, they say, helpless in the face of the forces of nature and the evils of life, looked to a power beyond themselves. If crops were desired or victory over foes, if pestilence was to be stayed or rain was needed, they turned to sacrifice and prayer. And the new world for which they hoped was to come as a deed of God. Science has shown us a better way. Look to yourself, it says, there is no other savior. Study this world and learn its laws and then you can make it your servant. Science in the hands of man, that is the new messiah.

And science has led the way to actual achievement. That must not be for a moment forgotten. It has brought to man a new courage, a new hope, a new sense of mastery. No longer does he stand hopeless and fearful over against the forces of nature. He has conquered

her dread pestilences one by one—smallpox, yellow fever, the bubonic plague, and many another. He has not brought rain from the skies, but he has learned dry farming and irrigation. He has captured the lightnings and made the winds his messengers; the forces of earth that once threatened him are now his servants. For we must not forget that invention and machinery are the daughters of science and that these two have changed the face of our modern world. Ask the average man about the progress of the world, and he will name telephone and telegraph, airplane and radio, electricity and the automobile, and compare all this with the poverty of our fathers. Science is the savior because it has brought knowledge, and knowledge has put power into man's hands and made him master of his world.

Now, the most interesting fact about all this is that the real leaders of thought no longer talk this way. They do not minimize what science has done and must do. Science must help us conquer the earth and banish poverty and disease. The higher life of man, all that is represented by the words religion, art, education, health, home, needs a certain material basis. Science and invention and engineering have prepared the way, but they have not

saved the race and cannot save it. That is what these leaders in science and philosophy recognize. It is expressed in keen criticism by C. E. Ayres in his volume, *Science the False Messiah*. It is put constructively by Professor R. A. Millikan, one of the world's greatest physicists. Vastly important is modern science, he says, "the spirit and method of Galileo, of Newton, of Faraday, and of the other great builders of this modern scientific age—this age of the understanding and the control of nature." But, he declares, "the most important thing in the world is a belief in the reality of moral and spiritual values. It was because we lost that belief that the world war came, and if we do not now find a way to regain and strengthen that belief, then science is of no value."

The fact is, science, natural science, leaves out the most important realities and the greatest forces of life. How, then, can it solve our highest problems? For our highest problems lie, not in the realm of things, with which science deals, but in the realm of persons, of inner attitudes and right ideals, of faith and the right spirit, of justice and good will. The fault lies not with science. Science and its methods cannot handle this field and do not try to do so. The fault lies with those who

imagine that the field of science is the only reality and the forces that science describes the only forces in the world.

In a sense, indeed, it is true that science, so far from solving our problems, has multiplied them. One might almost say that science instead of leading us into the promised land had brought us into the wilderness. We look at the world of industry. Led by science, we have devised machines and multiplied production; but we have not learned how to distribute fairly what we produce, and poverty and wealth still stand over against each other. We have not gotten away from war or learned coöperation. Our machines, that demand great factories and masses of workmen, have only served to crowd millions into our cities and make of them the sordid places that they are. We look at the nations. There was war before modern science came, but the World War was the first war in which modern science functioned on a large scale. It was not a war of men, but of machines. Every nation drafted its scientists and their servants, the inventors and manufacturers. Men became not fighters but mere cogs in the great machine; it was the first great machine war. Modern science showed us how we could drop our bombs upon great cities and slaughter men, women, and

children. It taught us the method of wholesale poison by gas, of the secret attack that could send a great shipload of souls to destruction, and how we could punish whole nations by starvation even after war was over. But how to find a better way science could not show us. It has told us how to spend millions on war vessels which a little more science would soon send to the scrap heap, and still more millions upon air ships and submarines and poison plants. But it has not shown us how to lift this crushing burden from the backs of the people who toil, upon whom it has always rested when kings and presidents, diplomats and generals, politicians and legislators, have done their work.

It is easy to say that science itself has not done this. Strictly speaking, that is true. Science simply put into man's hands this tremendous power and these great machines. But that is the point we need to make clear. Science has done just this, and has done nothing more, can do nothing more. Science can give us great help, but science can never be our messiah. It can put power into man's hands, but it cannot tell him how to use it. It can tell us how the stars behave and the electrons, but it cannot teach men and nations how to live together. It can describe the world of

things but not reveal to us the supreme values of life or transform our spirits. It cannot give mankind its supreme good or the power to reach it.

Here is evolution. The sober scientist looked upon it simply as an account of the road that life had traveled in its slow development on this earth. But for others it became a magic word, a kind of messiah. Not only did it explain the story of the past, but it showed the way for all the future. Man needs a religion, and some who had lost their old faith found here a surrogate. Andrew Carnegie gives witness of this in his biography. He tells how he "got rid of theology and the supernatural" and then found the truth of evolution. "'All is well since all grows better' became my motto, my true source of comfort. Man was not created with the instinct for his own degradation, but from the lower he had risen to the higher forms. Nor is there any conceivable end to his march to perfection." But the war came while Mr. Carnegie was writing the autobiography in which these words are contained. His volume was never completed. Herbert Spencer expressed the same philosophy of optimism, and Darwin himself in lesser measure. But this is a mid-Victorianism that is behind

us. There is no law of inevitable progress in "the nature of things." The easy way is down hill. Men followed natural impulses and passions in the horrors of the World War. The good will come only through striving, only with long and courageous effort. And the effort demands high ideals and clear purpose and moral and spiritual power for whose supply we must look farther.

Militarism is the idol of others. The logic of its worship was seen in the horrors of the war and the horrors, scarcely less, that have remained with the years of "peace," yet its devotees are still trying to tell us that fleets of sea and air and mighty armies are the way to national prosperity and safety. Closely allied to this is another messiah. It goes by various names. It is sovietism in Russia and fascism in Italy and dictatorship in Poland and Spain. Our fathers called it autocracy, but not a few in this country look at it with favor in these latter years, at least for other lands. This new way is as old as the Cæsars, as old as the pyramids, and he who looks beyond the few years, which are all that the average newspaper reader knows, sees the long road of human history stained with the blood of the multitudes over whom the autocrat has ruled.

The one great threat to Europe's peace to-day comes from these autocracies. Human nature cannot be trusted with such power. Nor can a people be saved by mere force that compels them to work and observe order. Salvation means life, and life must come from within. That means insight and ideals, it means education and freedom and self-rule.

And that leads to the further question. Is it democracy that is to save us, or perhaps democracy plus education? If by democracy you mean a political system with popular ballot and the right of self-government, then it would be enough to point to the men whom we choose as mayors, governors, and senators, and who enter the cabinets of presidents. Democracy is not a messiah, not a solution of our problems; it is an opportunity and a challenge, a faith, but not yet an achievement.

As to education, there is no way out without education; but we must have a far larger vision of education than has yet come to us. Of what value is an education whose aim is primarily to put better weapons into our hands with which to compete for the prize of profit with our fellows? Of what advantage is the printed page and the ability to read if it means misleading propaganda that increases prejudice and passion between the nations, or endless

tales of scandal and crime? We are still trying to find the way in education by which our youth shall learn to think clearly and independently, to see the high values of life and choose them, to rule themselves, and to work in the spirit of justice and good will with their fellows.

So they pass us, these messiahs, new and old. The list is too long for review. There is psychology, magic word for many to-day, with its varied gospels of Freudianism, Behaviorism, Couéism, or what not, but leaving man in the end with no more of resource than that which he finds in himself. There is the modern cult based on the assumed truths of heredity, with its prophets of the Nordic gospel and its eugenic salvation. No brief chapter could even name these claimants.

What, then, have we as Christians to say when we offer men our Messiah? One thing is clear. It is not enough in this day for us to say, this is the witness of our sacred Book, or so it is written in the creeds, or thus the Church has spoken. Jesus, like every other messiah, must speak to the reason of men, must convict their conscience, and last of all must meet the test of life. Let us see, then, what it is that Christianity with its Messiah has to offer.

First of all, let us observe that the religion of Jesus Christ does not put aside a single good that has been suggested above. It summons men to know, to understand, to reason; and that is science. It bids men master the earth, not only to know their world, but to rule its forces and make them servants. It exalts education and bids man achieve his true life and realize his largest self in preparation for his life with men. It brings no system of civil government, but it is plain that the ideals that make the soul of democracy—the principle of justice, faith in man, the sense of human values, the ideal of freedom—these have had their chief source in Christianity itself.

But the Christian religion goes deeper; it sees the real evils that underlie all others, it reaches the central problem. For the problem does not lie in the world of knowledge, the knowledge of things and events. It does not lie in the material world, in probing its secrets or mastering its forces. It does not lie in forms of organization, whether in industry or in politics. We have settled the questions that lie at the circumference, and we have failed at the heart. We have gained knowledge, but not wisdom. We have power, but we do not know how to use it. We have gathered material goods, but have missed the highest

values. We have learned to rule nature, but not to rule ourselves nor how to live together. We have gained the whole world and lost God.

What Jesus offers is, first of all, a faith, a faith in which the answer to every other vital question is given. He bids us say: "Our Father in heaven." The power that rules this world is not blind force, he says, but goodness; and you can trust it. And goodness, he says—love and truth and right—are not mere dreams to be crushed by the world's hard realities. These, he says, are the final realities; they are the power that rules this world. Jesus shows us God. So he shows us the final meaning of the world, gives us courage for our task, and an unshaken peace.

Jesus offers us an ideal, a spirit, a way of life. He brings it not in words so much as in the beauty and the convincing power of his own life. Through the years it has been the standing challenge to human aspiration and the rebuke to the selfishness and bitterness, the greed and narrowness and ruthless force of men. One by one the old ways have failed. The nations are beginning to see it, taught by the horrors of war and the threat of far greater destruction which they know that another war

will bring. In their plans for conciliation and coöperation and the outlawry of war, they are groping after Jesus's way of justice and good will. And the wisest among them know that the supreme need of our day is that of a new heart, a new spirit in men. So it is in industry. And so it is in the life of the individual man.

Jesus offers men a way of help, and his help touches the heart of our question. For the heart of our question is not knowledge, nor wealth, nor physical power through our machines, nor more inventions, nor better laws and institutions. It lies in the spirit of men. It is new men that we must have, a new spirit, a new humanity; not only right goals, but the power to reach them. Jesus summons men to an inner and absolute surrender. No tithes of money and sevenths of time can satisfy him, no forms of worship or subscriptions to creed. It is the inner life of the man that he wants, out of which all else will come. We are to trust utterly that God of loving righteousness whom he brings; we are to give ourselves to his way. And he offers us in turn a living fellowship with this God, a fellowship in which we find the power of a new life. Christianity meets the supreme need by its gift to men of moral power and a new spirit.

Jesus offers men a goal, a hope that will

satisfy their highest longing, an end that can command their supreme endeavors. We call it the kingdom of God—that is, the rule of God. But it does not mean repression, it is nothing external. It is the rule of an inner spirit, the spirit of faith and justice and good will. He calls for surrender only that he may assure men life. He shows men obedience as the way to freedom, and love as the giving by which alone we may have. His goal is not merely for the individual; it is a new world that he bids men pray for. And because the life that he offers is one in which men are joined to God, his goal includes the life eternal.

So he comes to our generation again as he came nineteen hundred years ago, and his message is the same: The rule of God is at hand; repent and believe the good news. God and his rule, that is the first. Men have lost faith; that is why the evil have lapsed into evil ways and the good have lost heart. The name of God has not been lost and the creeds are still repeated; we have chaplains for congresses and to go with our armies to war, and we have business leaders who rate high the value of the Churches to industry. But we do not see God and we do not believe in him, not really. We believe in nationalism, not brother-

hood; in armies and air fleets, not in righteousness and love; in dividends, not in service; in things and not in God. Jesus summons us once more to see God and to know that he is real in his love and righteousness above all other powers. He calls us once more to believe that a new earth is possible, a new humanity in which justice and love shall control. No messiah can save us who cannot awaken this hope.

He calls us to repent. We have been perfectly willing for others to repent, the Germans, for example, and the Russians, and the poor "heathen" peoples of the earth. But we who are rich and increased in goods and have need of nothing—why should we repent? It is the mark of this Christian Messiah that he has as little praise for this pharisaism of to-day as he did for that of old. For our materialism and selfishness, for our lust of power and our love of pleasure, for our pride and our emptiness, for our trust in force and our disregard of justice, for our blindness and our forgetfulness of God, he calls us to repent. There can be no salvation for our day or for our world except at the hands of some messiah who can show us our need and bring us to repentance.

And he calls us to believe. The real word here is faith. It is not the entertaining of an

opinion, but the surrender of a life. The acid test is not our chaplains who begin their prayers with our Father and end in Jesus's name. It is not the name of God in constitutions or the pious protestations of leaders. It is the millions that we vote for battleships. It is whether we will give ourselves in faith and service to the winning of a world without war, made possible by our passion for good will and justice. It is whether we will strive as hard for a fair chance for our brother as for profits for ourselves.

Jesus came in a time of desperate need, and their need made them ready to hear the good news in that old Roman world. Is it too much to hope that the need of our day may open our ears to his summons? The other ways have failed; we have lost hope in the other messiahs. Our armies have provoked war instead of preventing it. Our selfish nationalism and our race pride have filled the world with fear and hate. Our machines have multiplied wealth but stifled life. Our schools have concerned themselves too much with sharpening wits for a ruthless battle for prizes. The world of business, grown beyond comprehension, has exalted profits and subordinated human personality. From the futile leaders of the past, will men turn to Jesus, the old Messiah and the new?

X

SHALL WE EXPORT CHRISTIANITY?

BY WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN

A NEW ENGLAND legislature was wrestling with a new proposition. It had before it a petition to grant a charter for a Board of Foreign Missions. The zealous advocates of the measure had given the required information; it involved an organization to collect funds, to enlist workers and train them; it made necessary the handling of large sums of money, the sending out of its representatives, the making of contracts, the building of houses, churches, schools. A charter should be granted.

A protest is registered! "Mr. Speaker, if I correctly understand this proposal, it is nothing less than an attempt to export religion. This is certainly a commodity of which we have altogether too little at home." To us, after more than a hundred years, this speech seems to have been a foolish one. Yet the man had the very common and "practical" notion of the average man of business. Why not export Christianity? Is it not possible to export almost anything—oil, shoes, tobacco, machinery, medicines, food products, woolens, furniture?

Why not religion? All that is needed is a proper organization with capable executives, and to help them an able and hustling sales force at the other end of the line. Christianity is one of the best things we have. The sale of it should not be such a difficult matter, and when once a suitable demand has been established, business should boom!

But export trade needs, as one very necessary link in the chain, the buyer. Ask the man who is at the receiving end, and in these days he will first put some searching questions. The East has learned that all which comes from the West is not helpful, and so, before the goods enter, they must be examined. "What do you mean by 'Christianity'?" he asks.

"Do you mean to transfer to us what you call Christian civilization?" They are not very enthusiastic about this. They know of the many excellent features of our boasted civilization. They are aware of our system of education, which aims to make of each child growing up in America a literate person. More, they know of our colleges and universities, with their democratic ideals and wide-open doors. Do not thousands of their youth push into these same? They have attempted to learn from us the meaning of "democracy"

and, having no such word of their own, have in some cases simply transplanted it. They marvel at our system of medicine and surgery which has added from twenty to thirty years of average life to our citizens as compared with their own. They almost gasp as our trade totals are made known to them and as our machines of commerce are shown. Engines too big to enter their small stations, business houses rising like small mountains into the sky, speed for all, such as in the Orient may be commanded only by the merest minority; food and clothes for a working man which would cost fabulously in the East—they know of these. But they also know what we often forget: that the spirit of gain has become a passion with us; that we boast of our “billionaires”; that we claim to have half the gold supply of the world, leaving the more than sixty other nations to divide the other half. They know that the entire annual income of America, if divided among the working people, would give \$2,000 for every person gainfully employed; but they have also heard of the grinding of the faces of the poor. Have they not read the claim made that about one-third of the people of the United States are living in subnormal housing conditions? Do they not know of the large numbers of mothers and

children who are forced to work? Have they not been told of the prevalence of crime and the crookedness of those who protect it? Can they overlook the large groups of unemployed who go from house to house seeking bread, and whose poverty is being imposed upon in some cities by so-called "charity" from clever politicians? Certainly they know of our strikes and lockouts, of the Ku-Klux Klan, and all attendant and hateful discriminations of race against race. That boy from India who went to twelve barber shops before he could get a hair cut, those Africans who are not admitted to the swimming tanks of certain great universities, the Jews who are not allowed to register in certain schools and never bidden into the fraternities of the college of many States—these have not kept silence. A listening world knows the shadows as well as the lights of our civilization. They of the East do not think, that with all our wealth, our speed, and our power, we have accomplished real happiness, and they wonder if the culture we have erected will stand for any great length of time.

"But," we say, "these things are not *Christian civilization*." "You have mentioned the unworthy and anti-Christian features of our life. It is unfair to judge us by our worst. The

missionaries are our truest representatives." To this there is more kindly response. They assure us that not all the missionaries have been as helpful as the West has supposed, but that on the whole, they have been messengers of good will and bearers of help where it was sorely needed. Their sacrifices have been real, their devotion, particularly in times of plague and distress, nothing less than heroic. Yes, the missionaries have, on the whole, been welcome and are still wanted. "But," they say, "you cannot camouflage a rough and brutal civilization with a few gentle missionaries." They are still in doubt about our "civilization."

"Do you mean that you wish to introduce into our land your various religious denominations?" They have come to know something of the divisions of Western Christianity. As regards missionary effort alone, they know that over four hundred boards and societies are at work in "foreign" lands. They have heard also that there are no less than twenty kinds of Lutherans, sixteen varieties of Methodists, and that the Baptists have no fewer than eighteen divisions, with names running all the way from "Northern Baptist Convention" to "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit-Predestinarian Baptists."

They have been told of the petty jealousies in rural and city fields in America and have seen the shameful conflict of the creeds on virgin territory, where both groups were supposed to be sent forth "in love to save the lost." At any rate, they are certain that there are too many of them. The conflicts and struggles which account for the rise of these differences were not of their making, nor do they care to take sides in them.

They are told, however, that confusion in their lands can be guarded against. The field can be delimited, so that only one group will be in each locality. Yet, as the work grows, the fields will overlap and perplexities arise. In Africa, a native Christian wished to go to a given town and there teach his kinsfolk the way of Christ. He was told by his missionary that, inasmuch as he was a preacher, he could not go there for such purpose, as it was in the territory allotted to another Mission. "Who gave you authority to come from your country to my country and thus to divide up its fields?" he asked. The missionary told of Paul and Barnabas dividing the field between them, one going to Cyprus and the other going through Galatia. "But Paul and Barnabas were men like ourselves," said he, "and they may have made a bad mistake." Why draw

permanent lines brought from other lands among the Christian groups?

We make another suggestion. (Is it not strange that we take it for granted that *we* are always to be teacher?) "Make one great national Church. We will help you." Even here the Eastern man is not certain. Why should one great organization for all be the needed thing? It has not been the way with their past. Hinduism has its divisions—too many of them. The Buddhists have numerous sects, and they are not all agreed. A Confucianist may belong to Shinto and at the same time to the cult of the Taoist. Why may they not be left to their own choice of Church organization, inasmuch as they will have to use it?

"Do you mean that you have a system of truth and that all we have is error?" "Are we to renounce all that we have and take all that you bring?" "Certainly," some one would say. "We Christians know that we are right, and therefore you are wrong." Our Eastern friend is not certain of this. He is not assured that truth runs in such a straight-line way. He holds to the idea that each may have some truth. He has read in the New Testament—for have we not taken it to him?—that Jesus

said: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." He knows, too, that he said to the Jews, to whom missionaries are now sent: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfill." They wonder if he would not say something like that to the other great religions of the world which for millennia have provided religious sanctions for so many millions. Hinduism, with its great literature, with its list of devoted bhaktas, and with its profound attempts at truth, would find him sympathetic. Buddhism, with its will to renounce, its habit of contemplation, its hope of Nirvana, would certainly not be scathingly condemned, they say. Islam, with its reverence for the Old Testament and the prophets, with its acknowledgment of Jesus as the "Spirit of Allah," with its exaltation of God and its awareness of the judgment, would not be all lost. Confucianism, with its high sense of ethical relations and its profound devotion to what is good in the past, could not be entirely passed by on the part of Jesus. At least, the nobler minds in all these faiths come more and more to see in him the Supreme Teacher, and some are willing to call him Son of God and Saviour.

There are many things connected with religious practice in the East of which the re-

forming spirits are now ashamed and from which they seek to rid themselves—caste, sacerdotalism, low esteem of woman, cruel and barbarous rituals of blood, ignorance, and hatred of their brother. They believe that if Jesus were present, he would join them in this attempt to put away all which is unlovely. Yes, there is very much to be given up, much to be changed; but that they must give up all and take all they do not believe.

"We have read somewhere that you have come for Christian conquest. What of it?" They do not wish to be exhibited as those who have been forced to surrender. There is a growing distaste for the martial in religion: "Onward, Christian soldiers;" "We march, we march, to victory;" "The fight is on, O Christian soldier;" and other such hymns, while capable of perfectly good Christian interpretation, are apt to develop a state of mind quite at variance with "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth;" "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God;" "Let love be without hypocrisy;" "For love's sake I beseech." If the East were not so familiar with bombing planes, marines, and gunboats, they might not be so sensitive about the matter. But as it is, even the very

titles of good books, such as *The Christian Occupation of China* and *Christian Conquests in the Congo*, irritate many who are in the list of exaggerated nationalists to-day. They do not wish the Christians to make a "Paul Revere's ride across the nations" and subdue or get the victory over them. Possibly we could well abandon the military metaphors.

"*Is it meant that we are to adopt your manner of religious expression, Gothic architecture, majestic ritual, stately processional, sonorous hymnody?*" No one who has seen and heard the Western forms of Christian religious expression can fail to appreciate these. Yet the men of the East are not certain that they would be fitting to their type or in their circumstances. Their temples are not places which house great congregations for stated worship. Their mosques, wherever possible, are open to the sky, and simple in the extreme. Their devotions are in very many cases individual. Their music is more simple, more free. In India, particularly, the simple dress of the officiating Brahmin would seem too plain beside the gorgeous vestments of a high Church bishop. Here, again, the earnest religionists of the Orient, touched by the purer spirit of Christ, are coming to see that much may be left out of their religious practice which

traditionally has been a regular feature. There is an attempt to forbid the slaughter of animals. There is a strong movement in India toward abolishing the so-called temple virgins, who have disgraced the service. These and other features will have to go. May it not be hoped that the spirit of the Christ will take a crowning place in the lives of these multitudes? But if so, must they not be encouraged to cultivate religious forms which will make the most worthy appeal to them and enable them most adequately to express their own particular gift?

"Is it the creedal symbols which we are to adopt in the name of Christianity?" Coming, as so many of our Protestant Churches have, out of periods of doctrinal controversy, they have, as well as the older and "Catholic" Churches, formal statements of doctrine which in many cases those who would come into the fellowship of the Church are asked to accept. As historical and thought-provoking documents of great significance they have much value and interest for all Christians. But the Eastern believer in Jesus is not certain that he wishes his devotion to be tested by these forms. He knows how earnestly the search for truth has gone on among us. He has been

told of the many who have been willing to sacrifice life rather than surrender truth as they have seen it. With all this the men of the Orient have the deepest sympathy. They, too, have suffered much! Moreover they have not been unsympathetic toward the great propositions which have come to them in Christian preaching: that God is personal Father; that Jesus is Brother and Saviour; that men everywhere are to be one family of the common Father; that love is mightier than armies; that faith and trust are better than suspicion and fear. But as for the formulated statements, they do not believe that truth can be determined by a majority vote. Here, for example, is the formula of Chalcedon, which has been generally accepted by Latin, Greek, and Protestant Churches as authoritative on the person of Christ. It speaks of Jesus as "the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man; of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father, according to the Godhead, and in these latter days for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the

mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably, the distinction of the two natures being in no way taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only-begotten, God and Word, the Lord Jesus Christ."

Now, they do not deny or affirm the truth of this. How can they? They simply do not understand. They only know that this is not the description of a person whom they could love, and for whose sake they might gladly die. Some of them may feel like the woman at the sepulcher: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." While they are less than hospitable to such forms, they may in time and through controversy shape their own. If so, they will have the meaning of personal struggle and long-continued thought. If they could be left with Jesus, become acquainted with him, and interpret him, that would be best.

"Will you not bring us the Christ? Doubt-

less this is what you have hoped to do, but so many things have tended to obscure him." They have not seen him as they might wish. Our civilization is not sufficiently Jesuslike; our religious denominations have been too distracting; our confidence that we have been exactly right has been in some cases an offense; our manner of approach and our metaphors of speech have made our coming sound more like warfare than like the coming of the Prince of Peace; our ways of expressing the Christian spirit, while satisfactory in some measure to us, have not always made an appeal to those whose culture is sometimes older than our own, and whose satisfaction in their own forms quite matches ours; our creeds and confessions, while interesting, have not been cast in oriental molds and so have been unsatisfying.

One thing we both may have. That is a Person. That person is the Christ. He is the true cosmopolitan. His citizenship is of every land, even of the whole world. None find it difficult to sit at his feet and learn. The Christian West has for many centuries kept him on loan. From the East he came, and now they want him; and yet we must keep him. In that case we can both be satisfied if we be brothers. Herein lies the hope of the world. There need be neither "export" nor "import."

Christianity, to have its true value, must be home grown on every soil. If, with it, we try to transport our forms as compulsory or conquering, we shall dim the central figure. Much the missionaries have brought—education, an appreciation of a great literature, relief from disease and suffering, the uplift of fallen women, the cleansing of the leper, the elevation of the depressed classes, the leavening of the literati. Yet they, with all this, are fallible. Only Christ can satisfy.

The closing word shall be spoken by the National Secretary of the Y. M. C. A. of India, himself an earnest Christian and one of that great people: "The attitude of the modern missionary, therefore, is that of a fellow student with his Indian friend at the feet of Christ. The missionary knows Christ in his own way; but there is vastly more in Christ than is yet known in the Churches of the West. The greatest service that one man can do to another is to introduce him to Jesus Christ. But Jesus Christ holds in his personality unfathomable riches of the mind of God, relevant to human life and destiny. To learn more of him the missionary needs the fellowship of all earnest seekers after God, trained in a different discipline from his own. That is, in fact, the greatest compensation that he can receive from his Hindu friend

for the inestimable privilege of having introduced him to Jesus Christ. It is in this attitude that the work of the missionary . . . is bound more and more to be done. There is no less conviction in the mind of the missionary as regards Jesus Christ himself; Christ is still to him everything, the eternal Logos himself; but the attitude is not only reverent but much more humble, and therefore much more positive and constructive than it used to be."

XI

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NATIONS

BY WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN

PROFESSOR PARKER THOMAS MOON, in his book on *Imperialism and World Politics*, says that it has to do with "Gladstone and Gandhi, Roosevelt and Cecil Rhodes, Menelik and Mussolini, Kaiser Wilhelm II and King Thebaw;" that it combines in one story "the Entente Cordiale and the Chinese Consortium, Dollar Diplomacy and pound sterling politics, alliances and loans, foreign missions and raw materials, the Near East and the Far East, Mexico and Morocco, the Philippines and Fiji, Turkestan and Transvaal, Congo and Cuba." The sphere of the Christian evangel is no less wide than that of political domain. Our task is no less involved. Christianity does not proceed in a vacuum. It has to do with people. Peoples make races, governments, industry, a social order. "All kinds of people make a world."

It is for this reason that present-day Christianity cannot be understood apart from contemporary world movements. To count the
(185)

converts, tell of the Sunday schools, Churches, hospitals, and other helpful agencies will not make known to those who are supporting Christian enterprises abroad the actual strain and struggle involved in the work of the gospel "in foreign parts." Many of the most trusted leaders are now saying that the greatest single factor in the attempt to make Christ known in the whole world is the attitudes and acts of the so-called Christian governments.

Essential Christianity in Mexico has not only to do with Bibles, Churches, and religious education. When General Pershing went on his hide-and-seek chase after Villa, the missionaries had to come out of Mexico. When the American troops were withdrawn, the missionaries could filter back to their work. When an American landholder in Mexico to the extent of 600,000 acres urges intervention or even annexation, when an American legislator moves in Congress the withdrawal of recognition and the taking of sides by our government in the age-long struggle between the government of Mexico and clericalism, when an American newspaper publishes (with copyright) documents slandering Mexico's chief executive and is silenced only by a senatorial investigation, then missionary work which has its origin in the United States, however self-

denying and beneficent, has the added task of explaining its nonsympathy with such manifestations and of overcoming the hatred aroused in patriot hearts which do not understand.

It is loudly rumored that a certain great automobile manufacturer purposes to have more than a million acres of rubber planted on the upper Amazon River. That raises a comment and a question. The exploitation of Indian labor on the central and upper Amazon has been notorious. Dr. Browning, in his book, *New Days in Latin America*, tells of certain instances wherein laborers have been flogged to their work, and in some cases even shot when reluctant. Will this rubber be planted and cultivated by such taskmasters? If so, the tires which furnish our automobiles should be blood red instead of black that they might exhibit the shame of their origin. And if so, then the missionary, when he goes from the land of the touring car with his Bible, will be cursed rather than received with joy.

It seems now to be settled that the Firestone Corporation is to plant rubber in Liberia. The reports say that ultimately ten millions of dollars will be spent in planting these great estates. This will involve the use of thousands

of African laborers, many of whom have families and all of whom have kinsfolk. These workers will probably be under the supervision of American foremen. The conditions which will surround the black men and women on these huge plantations will ultimately be a greater factor in making world history than any fluctuation either in the demand and supply or in the price of rubber. Mr. Firestone and his helpers will be able either to set forward the cause of true Christianity, or else he can make its future path in Liberia a tedious struggle. Leaders in Christian work are hoping that his investment will do more than simply return profits, that it will enhance civilization among those who till the fields and bear the burdens of this great enterprise. It has been hoped that some trained anthropologist might be secured to coöperate in this enterprise, who would discover just what features of African life should be treasured and kept, as well as what items of paganism should be ultimately lopped off. May it not be that here we shall see proper housing, the development of model villages, with schools, churches, and a civilization which shares not only in the economic weal, but in whatever of cultural help may be given either by the capitalist or by those whom he is willing to own as fellow

laborers? Those who are jealous for the honor of America, as well as eager to help humankind everywhere, look forward with the hope that here we shall have an investment which shall bring rich returns to all who work at its tasks.

When we pass from Liberia to Belgian Congo, we are reminded of the rapacity of the early governors there. Bravely asserting in every document that among other things they had the welfare of the native at heart, they laid upon him continually heavier burdens until with its riches corrupted and its peoples decimated, the Congo cried out and a sympathetic world protested the sheer inhumanity of Leopold of Belgium, who stood at the head of the company. He was forced to turn it over to the Belgian government, but not before he had made a cool twenty million out of the blood and burning of the Congo Free State. It is better now, and the cause of true Christianity, which lagged as the old ravages persisted, is awakening to new life under the enlightened direction of Albert of Belgium.

At the Cape, in the Union of South Africa, three-fourths of the people, the blacks, are forced into about one-fourth of the really valuable lands and there urged to work out their own destiny for themselves. There the

Color Bar Law shuts out the black from even the hope of employment in the more gainful trades. In some sections "a native may not walk on the pavement, may not buy stamps in the post office at the same counter as the white man, may not travel in the same carriage in the train, may not use the same tramcar (or any car). At the station he must, however cultured, use the same waiting room as the most verminous pagan. He may not worship in the same Church as the European. . . . When to these barriers there is added gross discourtesy, the daily manifestations of contempt for inferiority, where is our Christian faith in the sacredness of personality and in the right of every man to free development?" (Fraser, *The New Africa*, page 189.)

In the Africa of the black man, the attitude of the ruling governments—British, Portuguese, Belgian, French—will have much to do with the progress or defeat of the Christian cause. The ethics, or lack of them, of the great trading and mining companies, will also cry up or cry down the worth of the religion of the land from which their leaders come. If they recognize and act upon the principle which has been so often proclaimed, "The greatest asset of Africa is the African," all will be well. If the decision is that they are there

primarily to make huge dividends for the present generation of stockholders, we may expect defeat. The missionaries may travel to the jungles, and walk into open graves by hundreds; the government, the traders, the mining companies will speak with a voice which will either further the work of the missionary or put an end to it.

It does not require any stretch of imagination to believe that the Church Missionary Society in Egypt cannot do its best work while the exaggerated and inflamed patriot faces the influence of a British Sirdar. The fellaheen of Egypt carried the water line and the railroad up into Palestine, and thought they were promised their independence when it was all done. The seizure of the Sudan, the control of the waters of the Nile, the development of a rival to Alexandria at Port Sudan—these have not made easy the work of British Christians in Egypt, nor even made possible for the American United Presbyterian forces the successful carrying on of their work without the embarrassment of being asked to take a stand on nationalism.

When Palestine was taken away from the Turk, a benefit was certainly conferred upon the archæologist and all who will study there.

But General Allenby, either in a moment of inspiration or in a fit of possession, announced that it was to become again the home of the Jewish people. The devout Jews from every land, subsidized and encouraged by their friends, streamed to Palestine. Christian and Arab already occupied the land. If a Jew came, another had to be displaced from his farm or job. The Arab and Christian do not care to be judged in Jewish courts, nor to come under Hebrew rule. The government has thus far established separate courts and maintained a neutral control. In the meantime those who are doing missionary work are in a whirl of racial and religious prejudice and strife.

France has a Syrian mandate. The Syrians were not consulted when it was arranged, and do not seem to love the French way of doing things. Damascus is the scene of rioting and death. French soldiers sweep through the land, holding it in subjection. There is talk of a possible transfer to Italy, again without the Syrian being asked. But France is counted a Christian country as compared with Syria, and Christianity is involved, not to say embarrassed.

Turkey has known vehement struggle between Islam and Christianity. More acrimoni-

ous still has been the warfare she has witnessed between Christian nations—Russia, England, France, Germany, Greece, Bulgaria. For years she kept her integrity by playing off one against the other. For good reasons, she does not believe that Christians love one another. When the new capital was to be established, it was located at Angora instead of at Constantinople, for it was thought that international intrigue was altogether too strong at the latter place. There were too many “Christian governments” at work! It is easy to retort that Turkey was a good match for anything which might be exhibited in international perfidy, but if so, her citizens reply, she has had apt and capable teachers in this art. Is it any wonder that a Turkish boy, enamored of Jesus, is reported to have said: “No, I am not a Christian, I am just a follower of Jesus Christ.”

India hung in the balance when the war began. It is said that Germany had hoped that India would avail itself of the confusion and achieve complete independence by revolution. But it was not so. She sent more troops into the allied armies than all the rest of the empire together save the British Isles. She gave of her treasure and of her influence. She had

been promised "responsible self-government." It is very possible that we, looking at the situation, may believe that Britain went as far as she was warranted in the increased grant of democracy. But India believes that she asked for bread and was given a stone. Those Indians who are most favorable to the government are certain that they got only half a loaf where they hoped for a full one. There were the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, the Rowlatt Act, and the calamity of General Dyer and Amritsar Bazaar! But India has quieted down and has been somewhat sullenly hoping that at the end of the ten-year period, for which the reforms were to run, she would have larger grants of privilege and smaller lists of "reserved subjects." Now, just at the time when the Statutory Commission for framing the new law is appointed, India is thrown into heated resentment over the book, *Mother India*, written by an American visitor, Miss Katherine Mayo. Did the book have any political significance? The Indian nationalists point out, that, aside from the question as to whether or not she actually got official help in compiling her data, following the publication of this book which Gandhi has called "a true report, but a drain inspector's report," the new commission was appointed. Upon this

commission there appeared not one Indian name. Three hundred millions of British subjects are to have laws framed for their governance, and none of these subjects will have a determining vote as to the character of these laws, although, of course, they may advise the commission! It is no wonder that, coincident with this move, there is a bill before the British Parliament asking that the Anglican Church in India be given complete independence, to be made as independent as it is in America or Australia. Some of its leaders say that it must either be given this new liberty or else it will die or secede.

In China the case is in the eyes of the world. Charge and countercharge are exchanged concerning the past. One great complication is that so many of China's best ports and good business opportunities are now in foreign hands. But when all has been said, there is pretty general agreement upon certain items: that the present treaties are unfair and should be remodeled as soon as possible; that extra-territoriality is affording cover for great wrongs; that foreign customs domination, imposed upon China in order to collect indemnities forced upon her by war, needs change; that duties on imports, fixed years ago and to

be changed only with the consent of foreign powers, need untangling (indeed, there are rumors that a beginning has already been made here); that the right to preach the gospel, which was put on as a rider to the treaty closing a great commercial war, is, to say the least, unhappily circumstanced. At least one of the mission boards, at the request of its missionaries, has asked that the protection by force of its missionaries be disallowed. It seems probable that other great boards will follow this lead. Even with this, Christianity, which has its direction from the lands which Chinese nationalists regard as exploiting them, will have manifest difficulties until these wrongs are fairly considered, and, if possible, removed.

During the decade of 1890-1900 Japan saw what the powers were doing in China. It was the time also of her war with China. A great wave of nationalism swept Japan, and the missionary Churches, in order to save themselves from coming to the condemnation visited upon everything foreign, organized as independent Japanese bodies. To these Churches many missionaries are giving a helping hand. The land laws of California and other States, the American immigration law of 1924, the Australian literacy test, which is maneuvered to shut out all Japanese, have not helped to

encourage friendly feelings. The Japanese are a traditionally proud race. They boast that no conqueror has ever set foot upon their shores. They know that they were one of the Big Five powers of the late war. The recent aspects of immigration legislation, which seem to her to constitute a plain insult, have not caused Japan to love the religion which came to her from those lands which she now believes to be injuring her.

America in the Philippines and in the Caribbean, Britain and Russia in Persia, France in Morocco and the Sudan, Portugal in East and West Africa, Italy in Lybia and the Adriatic—these certainly indicate what a “scrambled egg” world politics and Christianity constitute.

Our Christian world plans have to take into consideration the above facts. What shall be done? There are four attitudes, and after seeing them we shall need to indicate our choice:

1. *Isolation.* There are those whose religious ideas compel the assertion that they should have no part in any earthly government. To do so is not “of the Lord but of the evil one.” Their citizenship is in heaven. The less they have to do with earthly powers,

the more essentially Christian they are. It is not for us to set the world right. Indeed, it is going in the other direction, and the faster it travels, the more rapidly approaches "the day of the Lord." This world order is soon to perish, anyway, and our duty is to be uninvolved when the end shall come!

About all one can say concerning such an attitude is that it seems to disregard one great fact, that our present habitat is here on earth and that while we are here we cannot escape the inevitable contact with our fellow men in family, social, political, and ethical relations.

2. *Opposition.* Much of our modern discussion of this subject seems to go upon the assumption that every political contact of East and West has been of necessity an evil one; that all trade of whites with nonwhites has been only exploitation; that racial associations of European with Oriental have all been those of condescension if not of contempt. General statements of this kind are flung about as if they were self-evident.

Now the facts are that there has been much of give and take in this clash of the two cultures. Certainly the traders from Europe were held in contempt and treated with severity by Japan, by China, and by Korea. The races of the East were then, and are still

in some respects, assured that our culture is to be disdained if not despised. But when all has been said, those who try to see things from a Christian viewpoint are assured that the East believes itself to have been greatly wronged by the West and that the wrongs claimed are too evident to be passed entirely by if we would keep their friendship or even their respect.

3. *Acquiescence.* The naïve complacency with which Christians have affirmed providential partnership with all the political, social, and economic programs of their own land would be laughable if not so calamitous. The Portuguese bishop, sitting upon his throne at Loando and from that point of vantage giving his parting blessing to the slaver which went out with its bleeding human cargo; the first British missionary to Africa writing a book to prove that "slave traffic was compatible with revealed religion"; the pious assertion on the part of an American writer that "God had graciously overruled" the treaty which forced upon China the iniquitous opium trade, so as to advance the gospel of his glorious Son—these are illustrations of sinful acquiescence. One wonders what the Son would say if he were here in person. He would feel that it was about as true that God had overruled the

traffic in the temple of old for the glory of that service! Such an attitude simply amounts to making a supergod of nationalism. It is putting below this supergod of "My country, right or wrong" the God of the Bible, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

4. *Discriminating coöperation.* We cannot go out of the world while in it. We may not fairly receive the benefits of ordered society and content ourselves with condemning its every act and form. On the other hand, we may not humiliate the Christian ideal by subordinating it to any other power. What is left? The maintenance of an intelligent coöperation between all agencies which strive for good. A Christian mission has a right to expect of a government that it will show good will. A government has a right to expect of a mission that it will coöperate in every plan which makes for enrichment of human personality. Most of the world powers are now democratic in form. They make high ethical claims. It ought not to be impossible for a benevolent and democratically inclined government so to rule that Christian agencies may find steadily increasing satisfaction as both forces work together to bless the peoples with whom, in the plan of God let us hope, their lot is cast.

XII

OUR CHANGING MORALS

BY IRL GOLDWIN WHITCHURCH

CHRISTIANITY is, above all others, a religion that demands moral transformation in the lives of its disciples. Any attempt, therefore, to make application of the gospel to personal problems, or to those of community life, of conditions in industry, of national and international relationships, drives us back to a previous consideration as to the value of our moral standards. We are heirs to a double task. On one side we are faced with evil conditions that demand remedy. On the other, we are confronted by the demand that, first of all, we justify the moral standards that we would employ.

The fact that moral standards are changing and nothing seems secure only complicates the situation. On occasion Webster is said to have exclaimed: "The past, at least, is secure!" That appears no longer to be true in the realm of morals. Moral standards that seemed to our fathers to be permanently established are caught up by the tides of change. Consider for one brief moment the changed relationship

of parent and child, the long list of mooted questions that come up in the relations between the sexes, or the changed attitude toward the laws of the State. Merely to suggest such issues is to start trains of confused thinking, accompanied by mingled emotions.

There are here, it seems to me, four questions. An honest attempt to answer them will shed some light upon the present situation. First, what has brought about this change in moral standards? Second, what is it that is really changing? Third, whither will these changes lead us? Fourth, whence shall come our guidance in right living?

Let us take them in order. First, why are our moral standards changing? In one of his public conscience novels Dickens describes life in a workhouse in the England of his day. *Oliver Twist*, of immortal fame, is chosen by his companions to go to the master after dinner and ask for a second helping of food. Urged on by hunger, he timidly approached him and said: "Please, sir, I want some more." Whereupon, the whole officuary was momentarily paralyzed with excitement. Oliver was ordered into solitary confinement. Next day a bill was posted offering the boy for apprenticeship, with an additional gift of £5 as a

special inducement to remove him from the care of the parish. A depraved youth had been discovered among the inmates of that benevolent institution! The chief authority could only repeat: "That boy will come to be hung." We are pleased to think that no longer do we interpret as wicked the actions of a boy who is only desperately hungry. But are there not kindred wrongs that need to be made right? Here, then, is a partial answer to the question why moral standards have changed and will continue to do so. Some of them have been wrong, and some wrong standards continue with us. The protest of right-minded men urges the social conscience to move out and on to better ways.

But this protest against moral authority is by no means confined to moral standards that are palpably wrong. There is a second group that is in revolt, and in this case it is on behalf of an individualistic mode of living. This is the cult devoted to a life without restraint of any kind, the creed of moral anarchists. A young woman once remarked to her college president: "When I want to do anything, I first make up my mind that it is right." That was the fashion a decade ago. Conscience was told to approve whatever desire sought to obtain. Decide what you want, and then

throw about it the mantle of an approving conscience. To-day men go even farther. Some feel that to stop and label a contemplated action as right is taking undue precaution. Conscience simply *is* the strongest desire, and moral standards are merely a matter of private opinion. The sole authority is the will of the individual. Whatever seems to me to be right, is right, and the same holds true for everybody. A recent writer has reminded us that as the new generation emerges from the sheltering wings of authoritative moral opinion, it spurns altogether the terminology of right and wrong. Our youth, so the opinion runs, thinks only about the prudent, the cautious, the "things you can get by with." And so, he declares, it is time to introduce new terms, substituting beauty for righteousness, and ugliness for sin. Another author goes further and says that the latest form is never the question, Is it right? but only, Is it sterilized? Doubtless, this attitude is extreme and represents only a limited group. Still it is unwise to conclude that none of the tides are moving in that direction.

There is a third point of view from which our changing moral standards may be considered, and that is the distinctly social viewpoint. Here morals are considered primarily as a social affair. Under the tutorship of a

long and varied experience certain moral claims have been found wholesome, others a detriment to social health and progress. As a result certain types of action have acquired the name of right and have been given social approval, while others were designated wrong and discarded. Positive moral values are passed on as part of the legacy of one generation to another. Social usage thus selects useful ways of life that we call customs. Some of them become fixed as laws, or recognized as moral standards, for governing conduct in various relationships of life. Through these social adjustments are made and the stability of social life is guaranteed, and in these is lodged authority for social control.

But social conditions do not remain the same. Our own age, in particular, has witnessed swift and far-reaching changes. In such case inevitably there is question as to the older standards and a clash of opinion. First come those persons who are content with things as they are. The old standards have combined with other factors to bring them privilege, ease, and comfort. The old ways have been good—to them. Why change, they say. Why not stand for the tested values? The spirit of modern questioning is to them unreasonable, even impious. They see eye to eye with Mrs. Farebrother in

Middlemarch. "When I was young, Mr. Lydgate, there never was any question about right and wrong. We learned our catechism and that was enough; we learned our creed and our duty. Every respectable Church person had the same opinions. But now if you speak out of the prayer book itself, you are liable to be contradicted."

Sharply opposed is the attitude of another group. These insist that the so-called standards are only social usages, or customs, that have gained sanctity with age. They are only conventional patterns which changed conditions make obsolete. Times change and so must morals. The privilege of cutting our moral garments to fit new conditions is always in order; every age has done so, and we must too. The exigencies of social life are the sole criterion of moral worth.

Now comes a fourth and more fundamental reason for our changing morals. It is aptly illustrated in the title of a recent volume, *Changing Backgrounds in Religion and Ethics*. The moral standards of men are tied up not only with social conditions, but with man's thinking in every realm of life. All that is represented by science and philosophy as well as religion forms the background for man's moral opinions and ideals. We have been

passing through a day of changing ideas and growing knowledge in every field. But man cannot endure fragmentary thinking. We are compelled by the urge of life itself to try to fit together these diverse parts of our understanding. So in the intellectual ferment of our time, with all these varied conceptions cast into the melting pot, moral ideas and ideals have been inevitably affected. Out of it will come the new orientation of morals in relation to the scientific, philosophic, religious, and political lore of our time.

It is one thing, of course, to realize the inevitableness of such restatements of morals; it is another to make that restatement as it should be made. Nietzsche was one who saw the need of such reformulation most clearly. He coined the phrase which has become classic, the transformation of all values. He assumed the truth of the primacy of instinct, of life as a selective experiment in which the will to power assured perpetual conflict and a kind of progress. He insisted that upon this basis the traditional ideas as to man and his world were literally upside down; the old ideals of love and peace, of equality and sympathy, as found in politics and religion and ethics, must be completely transformed. In a book called *Beyond Good and Evil* he set forth the

scientific morality which he thought should follow upon the new knowledge.

One of the youngest of sciences, psychology, gives another illustration of how some theories, if their truth be granted, would transform morals. The reference here is, of course, to the behavioristic psychology on the one hand and that which builds upon certain interpretations of instinct and the unconscious on the other. If these be true, then our moral valuations are little more than an elaborate process of self-deception. But whatever our opinion may be of the ethics of the superman or of these naturalistic psychologies, this much is clear: moral thinking will be deeply affected by thought in other realms. There are no compartments in the world of ideas, no boundaries that divide a unitary human experience into separate areas. The morals of men must undergo continual adjustment to the major idea forces of the time. And religion and morals feel the force of ideas in ferment to an unprecedented degree in our day.

Thus far we have viewed the four outstanding factors in bringing about our changing morals. Men revolt against standards that come to be recognized as wrong. Individuals revolt at moral restraint in the attempt to justify an individualistic mode of living. In

various forms both individuals and groups demand the revision of moral standards in terms of new conditions. Finally, in every age moral ideals are susceptible to change by reason of the influence of major currents of thought.

In approaching the second question, What is really changing? let us be reminded that the newest thing about these change-producing factors is the language in which they are clothed. At bottom, they have operated in the Western world for more than twenty-five centuries. Parallels might be cited in abundance. In the second half of the fifth century before Christ, Thucydides writes his famous indictment of moral anarchy against his fellow Athenians. More than twenty centuries later we may read from the brilliant Macaulay: "Every age and every nation has certain characteristic vices, which prevail almost universally, which scarcely any person scruples to avow, and which even rigid moralists but faintly censure. Succeeding generations change the fashion of their morals with the fashion of their hats and their coaches, take some kind of wickedness under their patronage, and wonder at the depravity of their ancestors." Doubtless such opinions contain an element

of exaggeration. Nor do they tell us the exact nature of the change.

Perhaps some light on this question of the meaning of change will come by reconsidering an incident in the ancient Garden of Eden story. It will be remembered that the forbidden fruit was alleged to have the power of opening man's eyes to the distinction between good and evil, a power hitherto belonging exclusively to the gods. Such an alluring prospect was not to be passed by, and the immediate result is well known. Is not this a parable dealing with universal human experience? What is this picture if not a sketch of the dawning of conscience, the emergence of man as a moral agent and, therefore, as a human being? A creature stands on the threshold between animal and human life. He begins to see, in dim outline, the distinction of good and evil. At first it appears as a vague sense of shame, a dim awareness of a higher and a lower nature in man. Must not every normal person pass through this gateway? The birthday of moral consciousness, and of man! That is holy ground; it is the place where man first consciously meets himself and God.

But the door is not the temple. Neither are the vague pointings of conscience newly born to be confused with the insight of moral ma-

turity. Profound transformations take place in that interim. Moral values abide, changeless and sure. But man's understanding of moral principles is continually changing. Both in the individual and in the race, conscience develops by functioning in the concrete activities of human affairs. It is a growth imposing alike in its silence, its costliness, its glacierlike slowness, and its sublime achievements. The reason, of course, is that conscience, man's power of making moral judgments, is part and parcel of his entire nature and growth. It shares in a give-and-take relationship with the physical, mental, social, and spiritual life.

That fact alone goes a long way toward accounting for the confusion and conflict of moral standards. John the Baptist paid with his life for his moral denunciation of Herod. By his moral attitudes Jesus so alienated the Pharisees that they formed an alliance with their political enemies, the Herodians. The apostle Paul tells us that he withstood Peter face to face; they parted company in their work, though the two were equally conscientious. A great distance intervenes between the conscience of Saul of Tarsus and of Paul the Christian; or, for all that, between the conscience of a man leaving college or professional training and the moral self of five years

later. In the last analysis, change in morals is a corollary of life itself. The expectation of a static finality in moral evaluations is a false demand.

We may sum up now our answer as to where the change really lies in our changing morals. To give the answer we must first look without and then within. We look first without, at the world order itself. Moral values endure as one aspect of that cosmic reality. They are not of the stuff of which dreams are made. Man no more makes moral values than he creates the materials of physics or biology. The Copernican revolution in astronomy was not a rearrangement of the heavenly bodies, but signified a new view of their relationships. The conditions of moral health and growth have their abiding foundation in the world order itself.

If we turn from the cosmos to man himself, we find there also something that is unchanging; that is the form of conscience, the power of discriminating between good and evil, the recognition of the difference between right and wrong. When we come to the content of conscience, however, we reach the realm of change. That content is modified in direct ratio to the manifold variations of experience. The mental outlook, the changes in economic and social

conditions, all register in the moral self. For conscience is precisely the whole self dealing with moral issues. What really changes, therefore, is man's understanding of that proper adjustment to the world-order which forms the condition of moral health and growth. These changing moral insights are expressed in the principles and codes which men formulate for themselves.

The change of morals, as such, is then a normal process. It affords the needed opportunity for dropping the burden of age-old injustices and the baggage of moral immaturity from the shoulders of mankind, an opportunity for glorious exploration in the realm of a higher life, provided these changes are made with wisdom and discernment. Obviously change does not always mean progress. It is only the open door of movement; the direction is another matter. Moreover, the change of which we are speaking is not absolute and discontinuous. That would be insanity. The older moral standards are fragmentary and incomplete rather than wholly wrong.

Observations of this nature begin to disclose an answer to our third question, Whither will our changing morals lead us? That depends! The fact of change is a sign of life's open door,

a token of a creative tendency in moral experience. If we set our faces steadfastly against deep-rooted wrongs and are willing to pay the price of their removal, against the ruthless sacrifice of children for the sake of larger profits, the degradation of character through bestial sex relations in the marriage bond and outside of it, the use of other men as tools by reason of economic advantage over them, the exploitation of peoples in smaller countries by legal agreements dishonestly secured; if we refuse to surrender to such conditions, then the diviner life of the kingdom may one day dwell in us. Through the door of conscience, changed in terms of righteous love, both we and our children may enter a life vast and inspiring. If, on the other hand, we cling to our lesser gods and our vision of the higher way be dimmed, then the future can lead only into paths of fruitless wandering, and at last into moral oblivion. Or, as Carlyle pointed out in one of his *Essays*, the leaven of inadequate views of nature and human nature may bring a "superior morality" that is properly an "inferior criminality," "produced not by greater love of virtue, but by greater perfection of Police; and of that far subtler and stronger Police, called Public Opinion." We may live in the land of moral mediocrity.

It makes little difference whether we are motivated by social interest or a dogged and narrow individualism. The doorway of changing morals may simply mean that we fling ourselves against the enduring ramparts of a universal world order in futile effort. The processes of change may mean the entrance to a temple or a dungeon.

But what of the risk? Is not change full of danger? Should we not simply cling to the old? Yes, danger lies in every direction; but there is also the possibility of becoming like unto God. Here is the sign of life's seriousness and here its chief glory. Jesus of Nazareth reveals the combination in a startling manner. Alike in personal achievement and in his work he declares this truth. That is why we stand in his presence with reverent heart. So ought we to be disposed toward all valiant souls and toward all men of good will, for by them the dangerous adventure of living has been transformed into the glorious possibility of enduring moral splendor. That achievement is the spring of all true honor and reverence.

Now comes the fourth and last question, Where in all the shifting tides of experience can I find guidance in right living? Facing so many and infinitely confusing value claims,

how can I know the morally true from the false? In matters of such supreme importance, am I doomed to follow a will-o-the-wisp among unsettled moral opinions? Is there a reliable guide, and where? This difficulty cannot be minimized by light treatment. No ready answer has been found; indeed, this is a matter of life-long searching. Hamlet's moments of torture and days of indecision are a common heritage.

Thus conscience does make cowards of us all;
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action.

The best we can do is to seek guidance for each day, and seek it anew for each occasion. Measuring rods in the form of codes must always be inadequate. Jesus understood this, and so proposed, not a new set of rules for conduct, but a quality of inner spirit. When asked which was the great commandment, he replied, in effect, no commandment, but a certain quality of will. But properly understood this is not a matter of despair. Rather is this norm of a living spirit the condition of all our hopes for productive experience. Genuine moral growth renders to-day's ideal partially

inadequate for to-morrow, while at the same time it opens the way to more life and better.

And so we find guidance by looking within, by genuine self-knowledge, and by looking without to the suggestions of history. A wide variety of pictures of the ideal life are there to be examined. Every great ethical proposal has been tested as in the fires of history. Yes, and these various ideals are being tried out before our eyes. The earliest and still most prevalent ideal of the good life is called Hedonism, a life crowded with a rapid succession of pleasures and marked by exclusion of pain. Another may be called the Greek view, the ideal of the harmonious development of all the powers of the individual as he finds place within the state. The Christian idea focuses upon the whole character of Jesus as thoroughly understood and loyally followed. On the personal side, that means the realization of the highest self in the achievement of a Christlike character. Viewed from the social side, this character develops within a coöperative life, a brotherhood animated by the spirit of righteous love and called the kingdom of God. But the work of a guide is not to negotiate the journey. That task is an inescapable personal responsibility. Some suggestions as to the Christian way are to be found in the following chapter.

XIII

THE JUSTICE OF JESUS

BY IRL GOLDWIN WHITCHURCH

THE Sermon on the Mount reaches its height in the word of Jesus: "Except your justice goes beyond the justice of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." This statement about justice, or righteousness, looks in two directions. Backward, it points to the long road over which for æons men have traveled in their search for the right way to live together. Forward, it looks toward a new kind of justice, one that constitutes the kingdom of God. No room is left for doubt that such a relationship between man and man was the great concern of Jesus. The relationship of man to God must, indeed, include this. "If, therefore, you are presenting your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother holds anything against you, leave there your gift before the altar, and go away; first be reconciled to your brother. and then come and offer up your gift."

During the first decade of our century in Yugoslavia appeared a little book, *Yerney's*
(218)

Justice. Its author made a plea for a higher type of justice, a plea terrible in its realism. Sitar, the beloved proprietor, was dead. Yerney had worked for him during forty years. The son immediately sought to show authority. He told old Yerney to pack his bag and go. Reluctantly, yet without bitterness, the old servitor went—to find justice for himself without bringing injustice to anyone. He sought it among persons in all stations of life. Beginning with the son, he presented his claim successively to mayor, peasant, judges, an infidel, the police, and a priest. Not one of them could understand a search for justice by anyone not embittered in spirit. Everywhere he met with interest, but an interest that was chained to a sense of futility, to cynicism, or to a disgusting prudentialism which said: “Ask not for justice, but for pity and alms.” Finally, love died of disappointment, and hatred made Yerney desperate. He fired the homestead, and the villagers threw him into the flames. Man’s career, it seems, is one of mingled tragedy and glory, but always he seeks the light of a higher justice. Plato stated our question once for all: “Gods and men agree that justice be done. But what is justice?”

The earliest answer available may be called

mass justice. It looks at the group and overlooks the individual man. In this connection read the story of Achan in the seventh chapter of Joshua. Achan had taken as his own certain articles from the spoil of Jericho that had been set apart, or "devoted," to Jehovah. Mass justice went into operation. In this transaction, not Achan in particular, but the children of Israel had committed a trespass. The anger of Jehovah was kindled against the entire group; their army suffered disaster. Now Israel, in turn, divided, group against group. "And Joshua and all Israel with him, took Achan the son of Zerah, and the silver, and the mantle, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had. . . . And all Israel stoned him with stones; and they burned them with fire and stoned them with stones."

This kind of justice is not confined to ancient history. It still burdens our shoulders. It distorts our vision and blocks the higher way. Even in normal times we lump men together in antagonistic groups, by races and nationalities, by geographical boundaries as farmers and city dwellers, by types of work as laborers and managers, by ancestral stock that means honor or depravity. All members of a group

are alike. A Russian is a bolshevik and a communist with no morals. A Jew is a Shylock. A negro is an irresponsible child. An Englishman is a pest and a snob. A farmer is an "innocent abroad." A city dweller is a lounge lizard whose chief claim to consideration is that he is shrewd at getting something for nothing. An industrial manager is a social parasite with a nugget of iron for a heart. A laborer is a natural born loafer who works only when compelled by the law of economic necessity. Jesus came from Nazareth; that settled his status. Men knew his family; what could be expected of him? "Is not this Joseph's son? Whence, then, hath this man all these things?"

Having lumped men together in their several divisions, mass justice consists in giving to each group what some one of its members deserves. But that is not all. To this is added the spirit of vengeance which demands satisfaction. This is most completely carried out in blood feuds and in war. The "blood cries from the ground," or a nation's honor shrieks from the headlines; and the vengeance of one group pours forth its broadside against another, alike against the innocent and the guilty.

The world over men are asking: Is it pos-

sible for us to find a better way? It is worth noting that the descendants of those who stoned Achan did make progress along this line. In fact, signs multiply as we read the Old Testament of growing discontent with a justice that buries a man in his group, and that uses one human life as barter for another or for some material value. A notable moral distance separates the two versions of the story of David selecting a pestilence that killed seventy thousand people. The later chronicler makes David say: "It is I that commanded . . . even I it is that have sinned, . . . but these sheep, what have they done?" Soon or late questionings of this nature come. It is a decided credit to a people that first raised them. The Hebrew people are known largely because for them the search for justice, or righteousness, was the great human adventure, and God was associated with their quest. Some results are shown in an early theophany of Genesis 18. Abraham was contemplating the possible extinction of Sodom. He entered a parley with Jehovah: "Wilt thou consume the righteous with the wicked?" A righteous God must make that moral distinction. Then follows the possible reduction of the number of the righteous: fifty, forty-five, forty, thirty, twenty, ten. Can justice overlook ten men,

among so many? "That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked; . . . that be far from thee: shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Justice, then, must labor to distinguish group and personal responsibility, and must leave behind the last trace of the atmosphere of vengeance.

Our revolt against such imperfect justice starts us in the general direction of the justice of Jesus. But the way to that goal is long and hazardous. It leads across the plain of a legalistic and retributive justice where the Scribe and the Pharisee stopped on their journey. But they are not alone. Many persons are still troubled by the conviction that a vast majority of the human race are wandering even yet in the midway wilderness that borders the promised land of man's best dreams. Across the centuries the word of Jesus needs still to be heard: "Except your justice goes beyond, . . . you shall in no wise enter into the realm of life eternal."

Examples just cited from the Old Testament reveal that the movement away from mass justice began by the emergence of the individual from the mass. He begins to walk alone. He emerges, however, first as a num-

ber, not as a spiritual value. Even so, in some relationships to-day individuals are known by number or as an economic unit, as a means to some nonhuman end. It is too plain to ignore, that an individual can have numerical and economic exchange value without having human dignity or worth. Under the most favorable conditions, the time is long and the cost is heavy before the Christian idea of the infinite worth of human personality can win its way completely. We are living now where the transition is being made.

There are two dead-weight elements of legalistic justice that hinder the coming of the kingdom in all its fullness. They are our habit of stripping men of their human qualities, and after that regarding them as things upon which a price of exchange can be set. Many and subtle are the ways for doing both of these things. Consider how lightly we regard human lives and with what ease we pretend to replace their loss. Here we face the appalling death rate in normal times through infant mortality, through accidents in shop and mine and on construction work, by conveyances of various kinds by land and sea and air, and this notwithstanding the well-nigh superhuman mechanical ingenuity and knowledge of medical science for preventing injury

and in salvaging life. For example, during several years past practically a thousand persons are reported killed each year in a single country by automobile accident alone. To this must be added an incomparably greater multitude for whom life is a near-death existence on subhuman levels—empty, futile, bleak, tragic. And if we digress for a moment from normal conditions and think of the unspeakably futile slaughter of millions in a single war, and the measureless insensibility of the war-cry makers, we seem to be headed away from the land of sanity. Perhaps the worst feature of all is that we allow ourselves to become accustomed to this condition of affairs, and we contemplate its continuance with stolid acquiescence. If sensitiveness to the condition of life among our fellow men be the test, who among us can rightfully claim entrance to the kingdom of God?

If, in our day of legalistic justice, men are thus depersonalized and a price of replacement is fixed, how are these things accomplished? The first step is taken in any one of three ways. A man is depersonalized by allowing him to become submerged in the mass or group. Our very language betrays us. We traffic in "labor" and "capital," instead of trying to understand actual human beings who labor

in a particular way and various kinds of men who manage the investment of capital. Much talk is heard about the impersonal law of supply and demand governing certain kinds of social relations. As a matter of fact, we know that both supply and demand are actually manipulated by responsible men to the help or hurt of other actual human beings. In the end this talk of impersonal law is part of our alibi stock in trade. By it are men practically robbed of humanitarian consideration. The second method is the opposite procedure. Man is dehumanized by uprooting the individual from the soil of the social life in which he grew and lives. He is transformed into a kind of moral Robinson Crusoe. All the important lines of social relationship are cut. Responsibility is affixed to this abnormal creature that is human only in name. And so, if Jean Valjean takes a loaf of bread with which to feed a half-starved brood of children, start him on the way to prison and the galleys. If some individual assumes a leadership to agitate a change of local conditions, insist upon dealing with him by the so-called "American Plan in Industry." This is depersonalization by isolation. Not less ingenious is the third way, that hacks a man's life into separate bits and then separates the string of deeds from the

background of the man himself. So it was in the case of Silas Marner. On circumstantial evidence Silas was convicted of theft. To his sensitive soul this false accusation was next to unbearable. At first he sought refuge by living as a hermit in a strange country. Only by a kindly providence working through the hand of a little girl was he saved from total disaster and led back to himself. But the men who first sentenced Silas Marner to exile and a living death had threaded together a series of deeds externally related to the man himself. Just three strokes were required. First, externalize by falsely separating conduct from character, the outer from the inner side of life; then anatomize conduct into separate deeds; finally, identify the actual person with one or more of these separate deeds. The actual person is concealed by the rags of an artificial analysis.

After depersonalization comes the second step. It consists in dealing with human life as if the individual's worth could be replaced by some other value. Many are the ways in which this step is taken. A very common one is the notion of giving people what they deserve. Justice, we are frequently told, is just finding the equivalent for some deed in another's life. Anger and envy make one very

sure of finding that equivalent measure, and they make one adept in identifying another person with those fragments of a life called actions. A man is suspected of doing or actually does what we disapprove. His deed is abstracted from the man himself and then cut away from his conduct as a whole. Past deeds are inspected for confirmation of the opinion that this one deed really represents the whole man. Behold the criminal! Then, disregarding the real man and his real possibilities, we apply the rule of vengeance: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth," measure for measure.

From this pre-Christian level we move on now to the ethics of Jesus. The justice of the kingdom is the expression of the character of God its Founder. Since his attitude is unfailing good will, justice must spring from the self-same spirit in human hearts. It is a justice that is rooted in the morally complete nature of God and therefore has a universal constancy about it. Both the word and work of Jesus show its eternally dependable quality. It is not in any prodigal's power to change the Father's attitude. His love never fails to remain a constant and dependable good will. And not alone from matchless parable, but now from Jesus himself on a cross we hear: "Father, forgive them,

they know not what they do." Such justice is governed not by some single deed of our neighbor, not by what he has earned from us, but by the thought of what we can do for him under the motive of love. Said Jesus: "Be like your Heavenly Father, for he makes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust."

An objection is often raised here to the effect that this kind of justice is an impossible human ideal. It demands a righteous character in the one who would be just. To such a claim no one dares confess. At any rate, it is an impractical expectation for any considerable number of persons under present conditions. This opposition amounts to an outright denial of the whole Christian point of view. It is obvious, however, that the first step toward a diviner social life is an honest adoption of this ideal. An effort to attain the spirit of righteous love will test both its "practicality" and its worth.

We note now the second feature of this kind of justice—namely, the conviction that human life is of supreme worth and the source of all other values. Such an assertion seems little short of foolish exaggeration. What does it mean? Let us approach it first from the divine side as involved in the Christian

idea of the fatherhood of God. God's perfect good will finds its primary object in his human children. His life is bound up in theirs. Their worth is a real part of his life. "See that you despise not one of these little ones: for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father. . . . Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." In similar manner Jesus said: "Be not filled with anxiety about your everyday needs. Your Father knows and cares. Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and these things shall be added unto you." Approaching from the human side, Jesus puts the same truth. How can it be to a man's advantage, if he actually succeeds in getting possession of the entire world of things, but in so doing destroys the integrity of his innermost self? The question is answered in the asking. Man is what gives value to things. Wherefore, Christian justice looks first to the intrinsic, the irreplaceable worth of each human life.

A few years ago J. A. Hobson wrote a great book, *Wealth and Work*. He advocated the reorganization of our economic life on the basis of the supremacy of human value instead of the present monetary standard. That task

bites into the core of the problem. Compare the idea of intrinsic worth of men with the pæan of an editor over the post-war situation in America. "As the world slips into 1925 we have all become—every one of us—the owners of hundreds of millions of able-bodied serfs. We have a mortgage on the lives of both the living and the unborn in practically every nation of Europe except Russia. We shall have, if not gold pouring in, then its equivalent in merchandise. Each one of us can hope to have more to spend. With such wealth we can hope to do two things. We can waste it, . . . or we can mass it in ways that enable us . . . to remold the entire world nearer to the heart's desire. With money—and the labor of bonded slaves." In case the frankness of this statement on the value standard makes us wince, here is a more moderate expression of the principle in a more recent form. "We signed the contract, yes, but there is an ethical and an economical view of it. Ethically, I'll admit we were perhaps bound, even though our lawyers said they saw a way out. But economically we couldn't live up to it. . . . We had to terminate it." Here we have dividends frankly set over against human values. The reasons why the most basic condition of Christian justice is

violated are many, and the ways in which it is done are many, but reasons and ways alike are secondary until we are able to see the sacred value of each human life.

Jesus made the principle of the infinite value of human beings plain and compelling in two closely related ways. First, by his insistence that every person's life is understood only by taking into account his concrete social relations and his potentialities. His disciples were to implant the leaven, and to sow the seed in all kinds of soil. He considered a man's future as well as his history. The whole self was never compressed into a present deed or a past series. Jesus believed tremendously in the future of folk—in the child, in the rich young ruler, in the beggar, in the prodigal, in Nicodemus. Since a man's life is not composed of bricks, or squares, or cubes, the arithmetic of exchange value is altogether out of place. No one knows what another deserves except God, and he refuses to deal with any person on that basis. Not the inhuman cruelty of it, but the impossibility of a measure for measure justice dawned upon Shylock when he understood the words:

Therefore prepare thee to cut off the flesh.
Shed thou no blood, nor cut thou less nor more
But just one pound of flesh.

The reason is that the facts of life are living relationships, without sharply bounded areas; they are dynamic processes where the future has real meaning. "Judge not, therefore." Final judgments are never applicable. The old opposition between justice and mercy is groundless.

A second way in which Jesus unfolded his principle of value was by insisting that righteous love is unfailingly constructive. Its first question is never about getting even or making the offender pay. Restitution is a part of justice, of course. But it is most important to ask how a man can be fortified against the next temptation and be set upon the way to moral health and spiritual completeness. Witness the parable of the Forgiving Father! The father's mind dwells, not on the punishment deserved, but on making a new and better life for the son that had strayed. It was so with Nicodemus and with the rich young ruler. Of men in every condition Jesus says: "Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more." And to this must be added, Become sons of your Heavenly Father, like him in moral wholeness. The practice of God's Spirit is the way of justice. Jesus taught men to measure themselves, not by what they had

been, but in the light of the personality they ought to become.

But having seen that the justice of the kingdom expresses the Father's spirit of righteous love and centers upon the intrinsic worth of every human life, there is a third aspect that must be noted if we are to guard against misapprehension. There is in the justice of Jesus not one grain of blind sentimentalism. Righteous love is terribly impartial and severely critical of itself and its beloved. It is the severity of a surgeon facing issues of life and death. As we saw, justice seeks the highest welfare of every person concerned. Therefore it cannot condone moral evil. That would involve the prostitution of its character and the betrayal of those whom it should serve. No, the justice of love casts out every evil element. It uproots all foreign growth. It demands the labor of insight into concrete human living, the patient experimentation for ways in which the values of Christian character may become whole-heartedly desired by individuals and by communities. It costs nothing less than creative justice for selfish indifference or blind sentimentality. "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." An endless warfare is on. Jesus

flayed attitudes such as we daily show and encounter—vindictiveness, bigotry, contempt, pedantry, self-righteousness. To those who faltered at the demand of the highest values he spoke stringent words: "Leave the dead to bury their own dead. . . . No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." Prophetic tradition supports this emphasis. Men were saying that Jehovah's love for his people meant special privilege, meant relaxed moral obligation. Amos drew the opposite conclusion: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." Micah spurns substitutes in the form of offerings. Even the sacrifice of the first-born child cannot take the place of righteous kindness and reverence. Men to-day are saying that God is love, and evil doing is less serious than our fathers thought. Hell fires have become extinguished because God is kind. If we had less sophistication and more understanding, could we fail to see the poverty of this view? Could we fail to know that the only world in which sin is really serious is one where God is righteous love, and where all the infinite potentialities of love's life await us? Why, then, seek to conceal iniquity by exchanging new forms of sacrifice for old? Why,

indeed, pretend that the justice of God or man is carried out in charities that are made necessary by our greed? Do we really think that the eyes of the justice of the kingdom are blinded to the fact that some of our hospitals and churches, libraries, missionary gifts, and memorial windows are disguised apologies for ill-gotten gain? If Jesus is right, compromise of this sort is impossible. For the justice of the kingdom takes its clue from the righteous love of God; it views every life as an infinite value and in terms of its concrete wholeness; it is unyielding, therefore, in the basal demands that alone assure moral health and growth for every son of man.

The root idea that keeps recurring in a consideration of the justice of Jesus is that this moral relationship of man to man rests back upon a certain view of God and of ultimate reality. Jesus makes no secret of it; he is trying to evaluate every man as God values him. Ultimately, a man's worth is derived from God's relation to him. Precious, indeed, in his sight is the hurt and the health of each person. By his character God is pledged to care for his children. It is a daring idea; moral personality is the measure of the universe. In Jesus's view, if ultimate reality is not on

the side of man it stands self-condemned. In short, Christian morals lean heavily upon a religious and philosophical foundation. If, therefore, a man lack that religious outlook, that fundamental faith, the satisfying worth of all living fades. Not only does the dread malady settle upon the individual who lacks this, but through him a sense of worthlessness pervades every social relationship and enterprise.

Dean Inge feels that that condition has actually come to pass. "If I were asked to state in one word the cause of the failure of our civilization, I should answer 'secularism.' There must surely be some very deep ground for the universal discontent and *malaise* which have overtaken Western civilization. There is but little happiness and content anywhere, and the reason is that we have lost faith in the values which should be the motive force of social life. . . . Industrialism drags on, because the alternative is starvation; but the life and joy have gone out of it, and it seems likely to pass into a state of gradual decay. Civilization presents the spectacle of a mighty tree which is dying at its roots. When masses of men begin to ask simultaneously 'Is it all worth while? What is the use of this great Babylon that we have builded?' we are re-

minded that the medieval casuists classified *acedia*, which is just this temper, among the seven deadly sins. We had almost forgotten *acedia*, and few know the meaning of the word; but it is at the bottom of the diseases from which we are suffering—the frivolous and joyless emptiness of life among the rich and the bitter discontent of the hand workers.” If we are to regain the zest of life and the joy of life, whose passing Dean Inge laments, it will only be, as he suggests, through that vision of the world and life which comes with faith in God. Such a faith gives sacredness and meaning to human existence and transforms its whole spirit. But we need to add one word more to his preachment. Here is a good that we cannot win for ourselves except as we share it with others. If our life has meaning because of such a God, then will our brother’s also. From such a faith there must flow social justice as an inevitable demand, the higher justice of the kingdom.

XIV

THE SWORD AND THE SPIRIT

BY ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE

THERE are only two powers in the world, the spirit and the sword. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit." These words might have been spoken by Eugene Debs; but they were not. They might have come from the lips of Jane Addams; but they did not. They might have been written by Mahatma Gandhi; but they were not. They were prefaced by the remark: "Do you know what amazes me more than all else? The impotence of force to organize anything"; and they were spoken by Napoleon, who died urging his son to attempt the unification of Europe, not by the sword, but by the spirit.

It has been claimed for the sword that it is the one indispensable means of making the world secure, that security can be won and maintained only by force or the threat of force. And back of this claim is a philosophy which says that life is a continuous struggle in which only the physically strongest survives. But against this claim and the philosophy which

supports it are both the facts of biology and the facts of human history.

Biology says no. If life is a continuous struggle in which only the physically strongest has any chance to survive, such prehistoric monsters as the dinosaur ought to have survived. They stood like fortresses, apparently impregnable; they moved about like armored tanks. If they were not prepared, both for defensive and for offensive combat, what living creature ever was or could possibly be imagined to be? But those dragons of the prime that tore each other in their slime have one and all become extinct. They have vanished from the face of the earth, leaving only an occasional skeleton or a part thereof by which the imagination of a later day might reconstruct their one-time glory. They were outbred, outwitted, and outlived by relatively puny creatures that were compelled to rely upon something other than physical force for security and survival.

In the evolution of life the chief factor has been, not combat, but coöperation. Animals that practiced mutual aid have survived. The saber-toothed tiger sleeps forever in the vaults of the British Museum.

And if biology says no, so also does history. Ancient Assyria took the sword and perished

with the sword. So, also, did ancient Egypt and ancient Rome. We are speaking now of just two things—security and survival. Is it not a very significant fact that no great nation of antiquity that drew the sword achieved either security or survival? Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Macedonia, Rome—they, too, have vanished from the face of the earth. It may and should, of course, be said that there were certain other factors which contributed to their downfall. But even these other factors—the failure of Rome, for instance, to replenish her exhausted soil—were in large part the consequence of incessant warfare. Strife these ancient nations sowed, and strife they reaped, and in strife they perished.

Consider, also, the Europe of our own time. No one can say that twentieth century Europe was not prepared for war. Never in human history was military preparedness so complete as it was in Europe in the year 1913. But did military preparedness insure the peace of Europe? Did it purchase security for the peoples of Europe? On the contrary, it created a situation so tense and trying that an explosion soon or late was bound to occur. Far from securing peace, it invited war. Far from making secure the peoples who so heavily paid for it, military preparedness made them hor-

ribly insecure and left them in the end bleeding and bankrupt.

Nor is the reason for all this in the least obscure, if anybody has a will to see it. It has been stated very clearly by Earl Grey, who says: "The increase of armaments that is intended in each nation to produce a consciousness of strength and a sense of security does not produce these effects. On the contrary, it produces a consciousness of the strength of other nations and a sense of fear." This man, who occupied one of the most responsible positions in the world at the outbreak of the war, does not hesitate to affirm: "The enormous growth of armaments in Europe, the sense of insecurity and fear caused by them—it was these that made war inevitable."

The one only condition under which force contributes to security and survival is when it is "ordered in accordance with law, by a neutral authority, in the general interest"; when, in a word, it becomes a police force. A police force operates in accordance with law, it operates under the direction of a neutral authority, and it operates in the general interest. It does not, therefore, inspire fear, except in the case of crooks; it inspires confidence. It is quite literally disarming; it disarms you and me and all our neighbors.

How different a national army! The World War was a terrible demonstration of the fact that an army does not act in accordance with law. In time of war, an army will do anything to win battles. And it is, of course, perfectly evident that an army does not act under the direction of a neutral authority or in the general interest, the interest of an enemy people as well as its own people. An army, therefore, does not affect the mind of the world as a police force affects the mind of a city. It does not inspire confidence; it inspires fear. It does not develop a sense of security; it develops a growing sense of insecurity. It does not, therefore, insure peace; it invites war.

But notice, now, another claim that has been made for the sword. It has been claimed that the sword is an indispensable instrument of human progress, that it produces an exaltation of the human spirit in which alone anything of worth can be accomplished, that without the sword the individual would stagnate and the race lose its power to advance. It is worthy of note that this claim has been put forward by a John Ruskin and a Theodore Roosevelt.

But what, on this point, does history have to say? Over in Palestine there is a hill in

which archeologists have uncovered the remains of eight distinct civilizations. Through the locality now occupied by this hill passed the great warrior nations of antiquity. To-day, "the only marks of those tumultuous efforts, those vast miseries and conflicts, are the stones they carved, the tools they used, and the pottery they made." Eighteen miles west of this hill was the birthplace of one who utterly repudiated the sword; who said to his followers: "Ye have heard that it was said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I say unto you, resist not him that is evil, but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Have individuals who have followed this man become stagnant? Has the world, in so far as it has listened to this man, lost its power to advance? Nineveh and Tyre are but little more than a name. Macedonia is a memory. Rome is a ruin. Jesus, after nineteen stormful centuries, is the foundation of all that is most secure, the driving power of all that is most adventurous, the inspiration of all that is truest and best in our modern world.

If by the sword alone the race may achieve that exaltation of spirit in which great art and literature are able to flourish and social advance may be made, is it not a singular fact

that Germany, without a sword, gave us Goethe and Beethoven and Kant, and that Germany, with a sword, gave us Kaiser Wilhelm, Bethmann-Hollweg, and the soldier who ordered the bombardment of the most beautiful cathedral that ever lifted its soaring arches and aspiring tower to the skies?

There are, undeniably, certain splendid virtues to which war gives a momentary stimulus. It appeals to the latent heroism in human hearts. It urges men who have thought only of self to think also of others. It compels all sorts and conditions of people to pull together. But the stimulus furnished by the sword, like the stimulus furnished by alcohol, is of short duration. Nine years ago the World War came at long last to an end. It had called forth a heroism unspeakable, an unselfishness indescribable, and a spirit of coöperation of which it is not, perhaps, too much to say that nothing like it had ever appeared before. But how long was it after the armistice was signed before people who had pulled together began to pull apart? How long before people who had forgotten self began to think only of themselves? How long before people who had risked everything in a great adventure began to play safe?

War ends, not in a great spiritual uplift,

but in a truly terrible spiritual slump. Immediately after the American Revolution, you find what? Some of the most shameful land-grab schemes ever perpetrated. Immediately after the American Civil War, you find what? Some of the worst political and commercial corruption ever experienced. Immediately after America's participation in the World War, you find what? The moral horrors of the Harding administration. War's final effect upon the human spirit is always deplorable. Far from being an indispensable instrument of human progress, the sword is the eventual cause of social reaction. Except in the one case where it is used under law, by a neutral agent, in the interest of all, it does not achieve security, it does not insure survival, it does not in any way promote progress.

Let us consider, then, that other power of which Napoleon spoke—the spirit.

In a volume written by a lieutenant colonel in the United States army and now being used by the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in one of our State universities, the statement is made: "In this world of ours, force is the ultimate power." The context makes it perfectly clear that by force the author means physical force. Well, if in this world, or in

any world, physical force is the ultimate power, we may just as well close our churches and stop talking about God. But is it?

Even in the subhuman world it is not. Even there, as we have noted, the spirit has proved mightier than the sword. The wit and will to coöperate have proved to be more than a match for sheer brute strength. Pacific creatures, practicing mutual aid, have outlived belligerent creatures armed to the teeth.

And now, consider what our lieutenant colonel calls "this world of ours."

In the world of men is physical force the ultimate power? When Socrates drank his cup of poison, which was the ultimate power, the arms of Athens or the idea of the sage? When St. Paul laid his head upon the block, which was the ultimate power, the legions of Cæsar or the faith of the missionary? When Galileo was subjected to torture, which was the ultimate power, the thumbscrew of the Inquisition or the truth of the scientist? When Luther was tried for his life at Worms, which was the ultimate power, the sword of the emperor or the spirit of the monk? The mightiest empire "this world of ours" has ever known once took a village carpenter and dragged him to a skull-shaped hill and there, amid hissings and mockings, while soldiers

diced for his tunic, nailed him to a cross. But the pierced hands of that crucified carpenter have "lifted empires off their hinges"; they have "turned the stream of history out of its channel"; they still "govern the ages." To-day the sword of Cæsar lies buried forever under centuries of accumulated débris, whereas the spirit of Jesus is more than ever alive!

Should one say that there is something blasphemous, or should one merely remark that there is something almost unbelievably stupid in this all-too-familiar assertion that in "this world of ours" physical force is the ultimate power? To say that it is is not only to deny the existence of God, but to ignore the plain teaching of history. There is in the human soul a power with which bullets and bayonets are unable to cope. In "this world of ours," the ultimate power is not the sword, but the spirit.

Could the spirit give us the security which the sword has failed to give us?

Before William Penn came to Pennsylvania, he sent over three commissioners with a letter of greeting to the Indians who occupied the territory in which he hoped to carry out his "holy experiment." In this letter he said: "There is one great God and power that hath

made the world and all things therein, to whom you and I and all people owe their being and well-being, and to whom you and I must one day give an account for all that we do in the world. This great God hath written his law in our hearts by which we are told and commanded to love and help and to do good to one another and not to do harm and mischief one to another. Now this great God hath been pleased to make me concerned in your part of the world, and the king of the country where I live hath given unto me a great province, but I desire to enjoy it with your love and consent, that we may always live together as neighbors and friends."

When Penn himself arrived, he was the legal lord of a territory larger than Ireland, having received from Charles II a grant of land containing more than forty thousand square miles. But believing as he did that this great territory belonged by right to the red men who inhabited it, he proceeded to buy it from them at what he, and they, considered a fair price.

In 1683, under a great elm tree, he concluded with his Indian neighbors a sacred treaty, of which Voltaire afterwards said that it was the only treaty between savages and Christians which was not ratified by an oath and which was never broken. On this occasion, Penn

made it clear that neither he nor his followers intended to take any advantage of the Indians. If any colonist should injure a red man, he would receive the same penalty that would be inflicted upon him were he to injure a white man. Disputes between Indians and colonists would be settled by twelve arbiters, of whom six would be white and six red. No goods would be sold to red men until they had met the same test of quality which was required by white men.

What happened? Notwithstanding the fact that Penn's followers employed no weapons, either in defense of their lives and property or for the purpose of redressing wrongs, they were unmolested. One of them wrote: "As our worthy proprietor treated the Indians with extraordinary humanity, they became very civil and loving toward us, and brought in abundance of venison." He added: "As in other countries the Indians were exasperated by hard treatment, which hath been the foundation of much bloodshed, the contrary treatment here hath produced their love and respect." Yes, in other colonies where Europeans took advantage of the Indians and then went about armed "in self-defense," there were frequent alarms and occasional murders. But the physically defenseless Quakers were

splendidly defended by—good will. “The intentional injury of a Quaker by an Indian was an event almost, if not altogether, unknown in Pennsylvania, and very rare in American history.”

It is, perhaps, a gratuitous insult to suggest that what worked when white men were dealing with red savages would not work if they were dealing with white Christians. But if so, it is an insult which many white lips seem ready to utter. So let us take note of another experiment which is deserving of far more consideration than it commonly receives.

Three years after the close of the war of 1812, the Rush-Bagot convention limited armament on the Great Lakes to three vessels not exceeding one hundred tons, and armed only with one eighteen pounder. It was realized by sane minds in both England and the United States that naval rivalry on the lakes would not only involve enormous expense, but produce suspicion and ill will. Even the three little gunboats were soon withdrawn, and for more than a hundred years there has been neither fleet nor fort on a frontier of three thousand miles. There *has* been an unbroken peace.

But suppose that the jingoes and timid souls in both countries had demanded “adequate

defensive measures." Suppose that Detroit to-day and Montreal, were frowning fortresses; that the Great Lakes were patrolled by cruisers and submarines; that every year army and navy chiefs were demanding substantial increases of tonnage and personnel in order to secure "adequate protection"; that on both sides of the frontier young men undergoing military training were urged to visualize their neighbors as possible enemies; that newspapers in both countries were giving front page space to the publication of real or fancied "wrongs"; and that the mayor of Chicago were saying what he is now saying about the deep, dark plottings of King George! How secure, in that event, would any one of us feel? How secure would we actually be?

The very success of the American-Canadian experiment has obscured its significance. It is something with which the world has been so long familiar that it has been taken for granted. War between the United States and Canada is to-day unthinkable. But why? Why is war between these countries any more unthinkable than war between France and Germany? Is it not precisely because, for more than a hundred years, these countries have not been threatening each other? Economically, Canada and the United States are no more

dependent one upon the other than are France and Germany. There is, that is to say, no fundamental reason why, in the one case, there should be security and, in the other case, horrible insecurity. But for more than a hundred years, whereas France and Germany have put their trust in the sword, Canada and the United States have put their trust in the spirit; and what the sword, though multiplied a million times, has been unable to effect, the spirit of good will has accomplished.

The spirit could give us security. Could it give us greater fullness of life? The answer to that question is: It has done so. It has done so in the family, where affection has proved the strongest of all ties and produced a happiness which brute strength never did. It has done so in the school, where children are no longer whipped and where the association of teacher and pupil in fascinating intellectual adventure has provided a stimulus which the schoolmaster's rod never did. It has done so in the Church, where rack and thumbscrew are no longer used and where religious freedom has produced far finer flowers of the spirit than religious coercion ever did. It has done so in industry, where free labor has produced vastly more goods than slave labor ever did. In one

realm after another, the spirit has proved to be not only mightier than the sword, but more effective than the sword in the securing of fullness of life.

Now, therefore, has not the time arrived when in the one great remaining realm the sword should be laid aside; when in the vast field of international relationships the world should begin to rely upon the power of the spirit to achieve a security which the sword has never given, and a fullness of life which the sword has never produced?

But this reliance upon the power of the spirit must be thoroughgoing if it is to be effective. It must express itself, not only in physical disarmament, but in mental disarmament. John Haynes Holmes was once berated by an American who had lived for many years in Mexico, who intended soon to return to that country, and who took violent exception to the pacifism which Dr. Holmes was preaching. Was he going back to Mexico without a gun, to live among those "dirty greasers," those "treacherous niggers," those "good-for-nothing dagoes?" Not much. He had always had ready for instant use no less than seven guns, and on more than one occasion they had come in handy, mighty handy. Would Dr. Holmes seriously advise him to return to that

“damnable country” unarmed? No; Dr. Holmes would not and did not advise that man to go anywhere unarmed! He advised him to return to Mexico, not with seven guns, but with seventy times seven, and expressed grave doubt whether, even in that case, he would be able to live to a ripe old age.

If the United States is determined to exploit Mexico, or to let its Sinclairs and Doheney do so; if it is determined to bully little Nicaragua, at least until a few of its investors have recovered the principal and interest of their loans; if it is not unwilling to wound a proud and sensitive people, such as the Japanese by discriminating exclusion acts; and if, with respect to the broken and burdened nations of Europe, it is resolved to maintain a selfish isolation, then, indeed, it would be folly for the United States to disarm. You can safely trust the man who can safely trust you. You cannot be sure of the man who cannot be sure of you. A selfish, provocative nation cannot afford to trust other nations for the simple, awful reason that other nations cannot afford to trust it.

When, therefore, one says that the time has come for nations to lay aside the sword and put their trust in the power of the spirit, he means, or at least ought to mean, that they

should scrap, not only their armies and navies, but their hates, their prejudices, and their selfishness. War is not inevitable. When Tolstoi witnessed in Paris, one day, the execution of a criminal, when he saw the head divided from the body and heard the thud with which it fell separately into the box, he knew that no theory could justify such an act, that though "all the men in the world from the day of creation, by whatever theory, had found this thing necessary," nevertheless it was not necessary. No, nor is the war necessary. Though generation after generation, on one ground or another, have considered it inevitable, it is not inevitable. But the nations of the world must disarm. They must disarm not only their bodies, but their minds. They must lay aside not only their swords, but their selfishness. They must resolve to go to the limit of dependence upon the power of the spirit.

XV

WHY READ THE BIBLE?

BY ERNEST FREMONT TITTLE

No one who is really alive to what is going on in the world can fail to see that there is a growing revolt against every kind of external authority. Just how far this revolt is destined to go it is, of course, impossible to say, but it seems altogether probable that in the future, more and more, creeds and codes, constitutions and institutions will find it difficult to secure support solely on the ground that they possess official sanctions.

Almost certainly, I should say, will this be true of the Bible. Some persons, no doubt, will continue to read it because it has been officially stamped a holy book and because, for many generations, in both Church and State, it has enjoyed an enormous prestige. But many will not read it unless it is found to contain something that is worth reading. In years to come, if the Bible continues to be widely read, it will not be because some one clothed in the habiliments of authority stands up and says that it ought to be read, but rather

because it is discovered to possess some inherent worth.

That the Bible does possess inherent worth is shown by its many contributions, direct and indirect, to human progress.

Consider, for instance, its influence upon speech. For literally scores of primitive peoples, the Bible has been the means of providing a written language. Century had followed century, generations had come and gone, and still among many human tribes there was no written language until the missionary came with his kindling desire to make it possible for his converts to read at least the four Gospels in their own tongue.

The Bible, moreover, has brought into the language of many a tribe new words and, therefore, new ideas and ideals. In Tasmania, for example, the native tongue contained no less than four words to describe the taking of human life, but not even one word to express love; so that there the missionary was compelled to coin a word in order to translate some of the most vital portions of the New Testament.

Nor is it only on the language of primitive peoples that the Bible has exerted any considerable influence. Dante, whose mind was

steeped in Biblical imagery, became the creator of modern Italian. Luther, chiefly through his translation of the Bible, became the creator of modern German. And in the creation of modern English, has anything played so significant a part as the authorized version of the Old and New Testament Scriptures?

To-day Biblical phrases fall from the lips of many a man who has no knowledge of their origin. Such telling idioms as "a thorn in the flesh," "a fly in the ointment," "the eleventh hour," "feet of clay"; such blessed idioms as "safe and sound," "a labor of love"; such thought-provoking idioms as "filthy lucre," "a voice in the wilderness," "no respecter of persons," "can the leopard change his spots?" are used by a multitude of men who would be not a little surprised to discover that they came from the Bible. Not long ago, in a certain New Jersey town, when the suggestion was made that a war memorial should bear the inscription, "The nations shall beat their swords into plowshares," a veritable storm of protest was raised by zealous patriots who suspected that that inscription had been framed in Moscow.

It is safe to say that the Bible has been more widely read than any other volume ever published. Has it ever been read without at least

some profit to the one who read it? Men have found in the Bible, as Coleridge did, "words for their innermost thoughts, songs for their joy, utterances for their hidden griefs, pleadings for their shame and feebleness." They have turned to it in time of trouble and found comfort. They have opened it when sorely tempted, and found reënforcement. They have gotten from it a vision of sin which has sobered them, and a vision of moral purity, of spiritual beauty, which has inspired them. They have entered through its pages into a deep and enduring peace which has enabled them to face a world in opposition and come off more than conqueror. And those uncounted millions of men and women whose souls were nourished by the Bible must have made the world a fairer place than otherwise it would have been.

When it comes to social progress, it is possible, no doubt, to claim too much for the Bible: and there is, of course, the prior question whether, during the nearly twenty centuries which have witnessed the use of the Bible there has been any progress on other than mechanical lines. The notion that there has been George Bernard Shaw pronounces "too absurd for discussion"—and then proceeds to

discuss it at considerable length. His contention is, in part, that between any given stratum of society to-day and its corresponding stratum two thousand years ago, there is hardly the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum.

Well, it would be rather difficult to-day to find a cultivated person who would recommend that the children of inferior parents, and the maimed offspring of others, should be put out of the way at birth; yet exactly that recommendation was made by the most cultivated man in the ancient world. And although in Plato's "Republic" the word slavery does not occur, the thing itself, even ideally, is conceded. Nor does Plato hold any different view from the less enlightened of his contemporaries with respect to Greeks and non-Greeks—namely, that they are natural enemies to whose relationship the code of justice does not apply.

When all has been admitted that really needs to be admitted concerning what Shaw calls "the savagery, barbarism, dark ages, and all the rest of it," and of which he says that it exists at this present moment, does not the fact remain that there exists also at this present moment a recognition of the sacredness of human life that did not exist even in so highly

cultivated a mind as that of Plato? And when you venture to ask why it exists, are you not compelled to take account of certain ideas which came into the world by way of the Bible? Many, indeed, of the stark realities of our time are not unlike the stark realities of twenty or more centuries ago. There is, however, a very significant difference; whereas in the ancient world these deplorable realities were not deplored, in the modern world they are deplored by a steadily increasing number of persons. Where will you find any adequate explanation of this difference if not in those humanizing influences which certain biblical conceptions have released among men?

But all this being granted, we have still to deal with the question, Why read the Bible now? Even though it can be shown that the Bible has rendered an inestimable service to other generations, it remains to be shown that it can render an equal service to our generation; and, as was intimated at the start, unless this can be shown, our generation is not likely to read it. Here is a collection of ancient chronicles, folk tales, poems, love stories, sermons, letters, ecstatic visions, and prophetic dreams, of which even the latest portions were written before the fall of the Roman empire—written

by Orientals for Orientals. What has it to offer to twentieth century minds?

Matthew Arnold's definition of culture as "getting to know the best that has been thought and said in the world" is admittedly inadequate; but that it does suggest at least one aspect of culture nobody, I take it, would deny. Here, then, is one reason for reading the Bible to-day. Unless and until you do read it, you cannot know the best that has been thought and said in the world.

It must, of course, be acknowledged that not a little of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, is below the level of the best thought of our own time. We cannot too often remind ourselves that what the Bible offers is a progressive revelation in which one passes from the crude, primitive notions of a Joshua to the sublime conceptions of Jesus. But neither can we too often remind ourselves that the most splendid ideas and ideals that have ever captured the imagination of the race are found in the Bible. And to trace their development, to follow the idea of God as it moves from the garden of Eden to the garden of Gethsemane; to follow the idea of man as it passes from the belief that the individual matters nothing to the belief that he matters so

much that the whole world of material values as compared to him matters nothing; to follow the idea of duty as it advances from a ritual demand to a moral demand, and from a demand for outward conformity to a demand for inner purity; to follow the idea of suffering as it passes from the crude notion of a divine punishment to the sublime conception of a divine self-giving, a sacrifice of self for the sake of others—to do this is surely to know the best that has been thought and said in the world.

Great ideas produce an elevation of the mind from which comes normally a literary style that is noble and chaste, free at once from vulgarity and sentimentality. To anyone who aspires to achieve literary distinction, no better advice could be given than to read, mark, and inwardly digest the English Bible.

The pure literary merit of the Bible is by no means equal throughout, but Tennyson pronounced the Book of Job the greatest poem in any language. Consider also such a passage as this:

‘Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God; where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried.’

Or this:

‘And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and death shall be no more; neither shall there be sorrow nor crying nor pain any more.’

Where in any literature will you find anything more beautiful than that?

Surely it is a significant fact that all the great masters of English speech have drunk deep from the well of the English Bible. The authorized version of the Scriptures came too late for Shakespeare, but his literary indebtedness to early versions is recognized by all Shakespearean students. Ruskin, Carlyle, Newman, and Wordsworth were intense students of the Old and New Testaments. And would it be too much to say that the Gettysburg speech would never have been delivered, the Second Inaugural never written, had not Abraham Lincoln steeped his mind in the language of the Bible?

The influence of the Bible upon letters has been so pronounced that ignorance of it constitutes to-day “an almost fatal handicap in the reading of any great literature of our Western world.” In Goethe, Shakespeare, Browning, Tennyson, Emerson, Lowell, and many another, there are literally scores of passages which must remain unintelligible to

anyone who has no acquaintance with the Bible. And how can one hope to understand and appreciate the oratorios of Handel or of Haydn, the paintings of Michelangelo or of Raphael, or Botticelli or of Fra Angelico, if he knows no more about the Bible than he does about Einstein's theory of relativity?

Is it not a very significant fact that not only to great writers, but to great artists and musicians the Bible has furnished inspiration for some of the greatest of all their productions; that it has, so to speak, lighted the spark of their genius? Its noble ideas nobly phrased have provided just the stimulus that was needed to start the flow of their creative power. And one cannot but wonder what would happen if this present generation should leave the Bible an unopened book. Would creativity of the highest sort continue to manifest itself? Would great literature continue to be written, great art continue to be produced? Out of the loftiest thought of the Old and New Testament Scriptures has appeared hitherto the loftiest attainment of Western genius. Would Western genius continue to be fructified if it were cut off from the greatest literary source of its artistic achievement? The question admits, of course, of no dogmatic answer, but

it is surely a question which needs to be lifted in connection with the theme which we are here discussing. It might conceivably prove to be true that a generation unacquainted with the Bible would be not only unable to understand and appreciate its own classics, but be itself unable to produce classics, whether of literature or of art.

Nor is the achievement of culture the only reason for reading the Bible to-day. No one can say exactly how or when the Bible appeared in its present form. All that we know is that about the middle of the fourth century the books which now comprise the Bible were generally regarded as sacred Scriptures by Christian men. They were not selected by any official body; they represent the entirely unofficial selections of thousands of human beings who found them helpful. Just why they found some of them helpful it is a little difficult at this distance to say. Some of them, to tell the truth, are not very helpful to us. They are interesting, it may be, as historical documents, as revelations of the depths out of which the race has struggled, but hardly the sort of writing to which we ourselves would instinctively turn in time of need. *Some* of them I say, with a decided emphasis on the

word some, for there are others which minister to our very deepest needs.

As children we were fascinated with the story of David and Goliath. It was even better than the story of Jack the Giant Killer. And what a thrill we got out of Daniel in the lions' den, and the capture of Jericho, and the somewhat dubious exploits of that ancient rough-neck named Samson. And the story of Joseph, he of the coat of many colors and the envy of many brothers—did it not hold us spellbound? As children, however, we discovered that much of the Bible was over our heads. The organ music of the Psalms, the great passages of Isaiah, the gentle, heroic figure of Jeremiah, the letters of St. Paul, many, even, of the sayings of Jesus, made no impression upon us. But as we grew older, how many hitherto unintelligible passages became pregnant with meaning. We, too, knew moments when our "feet were almost gone," our "steps had well-nigh slipped." We, too, felt the need of saying

Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness:

According to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

When we stood tear-blinded in the midst of

our first great sorrow, we, too, wanted to cry out

Love is strong as death;
Many waters cannot quench love,
Neither can floods drown it.

And when, after months of lonely wrestling with a great despair, we achieved at last a kind of peace and found ourselves able to make a go of life, how well we understood that ancient testimony,

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside still waters.
He restoreth my soul.

"The Bible," Coleridge once remarked, "finds me." The Bible does find us. It finds the very deepest places in our life, meets every significant experience which comes to us with an experience strikingly similar, and brings us into contact with the eternal source of help and healing. A good deal of the Bible is still over our heads, for the reason that a good deal of it can never fully be understood by any save very heroic spirits.

Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you.

A saying such as that is not likely to be understood even by an octogenarian, if he has spent all his eighty years carefully picking out the line of least resistance. But many of us have the conviction that into whatever experience life may yet take us, we shall be able somewhere in the Bible to find our case covered and our need prescribed.

What a help the Bible might be to any man who is sorely tempted. There is still

The ancient lie that lust is love
And passion what it seems,
A lotus land where men may find
The heaven of their dreams.

In the presence of this ancient lie, what a help to be able to repeat,

There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof is death.

or to recall,

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord?
And who shall stand in his holy place?
He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart.

There is still the temptation to sell one's soul for "a mess of pottage," or for "a handful of silver," or for "a ribband to stick in one's coat," for social recognition or for political or eccle-

siastical power. In the presence of such a temptation, what a help to be able to say,

“Whosoever would save his life shall lose it. . . .
What shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world
and lose his own soul?”

There is still the temptation to do unto others as they have done unto you, to return coldness for coldness, neglect for neglect, hate for hate; to harbor the seemingly sweet but bitter hope of revenge. Face to face with such a temptation, what a help to repeat the words, “Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us,” and to read again the story of one who, being crucified, prayed, “Father forgive them; for they know not what they do.”

There is still the temptation to turn back from an idealistic undertaking the moment the road becomes rough and opposition develops; and when that temptation comes, what a help to turn to the place where it is written, “He that putteth his hand to the plow and turneth back is not fit for the kingdom of God,” and then to stand in the presence of One who did not turn back, even when he saw that what was ahead of him was a cross.

So deep and intense is the ethical interest which pervades the Bible that one can hardly

read it without experiencing a definite quickening of his own moral sense. And when it comes to social righteousness, to that which really exalts a people, where in all the world will you find such penetrating insight as you do in the Bible?

Woodrow Wilson once declared that not in all the textbooks on government put together is the essential spirit of democratic institutions so well expressed as it is in a few lines of Tennyson:

Some sense of duty, something of a faith,
Some reverence for the laws ourselves have made,
Some patient force to change them when we will,
Some civic manhood firm against the crowd.

In like manner it may, I think, be said that more and more in days to come will it be recognized that the wisest of all counsel, whether for business, for industry, or for government, is to be found in the New Testament.

Just after the Treaty of Versailles was published to the world, there came from at least a few Christian pulpits a word of warning. Men whose acquaintance with textbooks on political economy was admittedly small, but who had pondered the principles laid down in the Sermon on the Mount, did not hesitate to predict that this revengeful treaty would not work, that its harsh terms would have to be

modified. Unable though they were to produce any such brilliant critique of its economic aspects as came from the pen of John Maynard Keynes, they saw clearly enough that it was a profoundly unchristian instrument, and, believing as they did that nothing profoundly unchristian can permanently succeed in our world, they uttered a prophecy which has been fulfilled.

My own belief is that whether in respect of the conduct of business, the organization of industry, or the aims of diplomacy, not only is the New Testament a practical book, but that the principles which it enunciates are the only principles that are practicable in the long run. I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I venture to predict that a time will come when any man who has no acquaintance with nor faith in the ethical teachings of the New Testament will be considered unfit to conduct a great business, to operate a great industry, or to represent a great nation.

Many people believe that we are witnessing to-day a new birth of interest in religion. Neither wealth nor science has brought us to the land of our heart's desire. Many a man who has great possessions is, nevertheless, wretchedly unhappy. And does not every thoughtful person realize that science, without

that sense of obligation which is born of a religious conception of life, will merely multiply and make more terrible the instruments of destruction? Wealth and invention have grown from more to more. Here in America many a laborer enjoys physical comforts which, but a few centuries ago, even kings did not possess. But the human heart is still hungry, strangely restless and discontented. Are we beginning to realize that man cannot live by bread alone? Are we beginning to suspect that life's true aims are spiritual, that unless we do labor for that which is more than bread, our souls will always be hungry?

If we are, we have arrived at a place in human experience where the Bible can speak to us as it has spoken to generation after generation before us, and where it can minister to us as can no other book. When you open the Bible, you find yourself in a world where the almighty God is alive; where human faces are lifted from the clod and human eyes see far beyond the visible horizon, and human hearts are sustained by mighty hopes; where the greatest and surest of all realities are spiritual realities; and where the end of all human striving is not a dismal question mark, but for the individual a blessed immortality, and for the race a glorious kingdom of God.

